

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY

**OU\_154803**

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



OUP—391 - 29-4-72—10,000.

## OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 1175.21

Accession No. 1085.3

Author

Title

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.





OUTLINES OF  
TIBETO-BURMAN LINGUISTIC MORPHOLOGY



PRIZE PUBLICATION FUND

VOL. XII

# Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology

*With special reference to the Prefixes, Infixes and Suffixes  
of Classical Tibetan and the Languages of  
the Kachin, Bodo, Nàgà, Kùkì-Chin  
and Burma Groups*

BY

STUART N. WOLFENDEN

FELLOW OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE, MEMBER OF THE ROYAL  
ASIATIC SOCIETY, MEMBER OF THE BURMA RESEARCH SOCIETY, MEMBER OF  
THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF  
THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

AND SOLD AT

74 GROSVENOR STREET, LONDON, W. 1

1929



## PREFACE

THE matter presented in the following pages is the outcome of an investigation originally intended to be of much lesser scope, and to embrace, primarily, certain of the prefix usages of the Assam area in relation to those of Tibetan.

For reasons, however, which will be readily apparent, other inseparably interlinked morphological principles of various related languages, have been introduced, until the originally collected material is only a small part of the now larger whole. We have by this means, I trust, gained a clearer view of the prefix, and other, formations in at least a part of the Tibeto-Burman field.

The first serious attempt in this direction was made by Conrady in 1896, but an examination of his *Eine Indochinesische Causativ-Denominativ Bildung* soon convinced me that much closer attention must be paid to detail, and the material be dealt with in a much less subjective attitude, if we were to ever satisfactorily explain the functions of the morphological equipment of these languages.

Too little attention has been paid the Tibeto-Burman Family in the past, a fact recently lamented by Father W. Schmidt in his most remarkable work *Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde* (p. 125), a reading of which has convinced me anew that a fresh avenue of approach is needed in linguistic investigation, in which the close interlinking and definite interdependence of one process of thought-expression upon another is kept more clearly in the foreground. We should never investigate a supposed "Causative-Denominative" formation without reference to other processes in the same, and related, languages.

It is my earnest hope that the following pages will stimulate interest in these languages, and bring again into discussion questions which, if they had belonged in almost any other Family of speech, would have already been satisfactorily solved.

S. N. W.

LONDON. ....



# CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

A	SECTION	PAGE
A new interpretation of Tibetan prefixes and their probable original sense . . . . .	1	1
These elements not in any sense formatives. . . . .	2	5
B		
The languages without prefixes and the probability of their having originally possessed them . . . . .	3	5
The evidence of varying word order . . . . .	4	6
Traces of changes in thought-sequence and their significance in the Indo-Chinese field . . . . .	5	7
C		
Material employed . . . . .	6	10
Transliteration. . . . .	7	11

## Tibetan

A		
Probable origin of the rigidity of the prefix system of the written language . . . . .	8	12
Classification of articulate speech sounds according to the native grammarians . . . . .	9	13
B		
The verb as a verbal noun and the methods employed to place it in touch with its subject and object . . . . .	10	15
The determination of the external objective connections of the verb . . . . .	11	17

### *Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

The material preserved in the written language . . . . .	12	18
Tabular statement of prefixes and suffixes in the eight systems <i>m-, b-, q-, d-, g-, r-, l-, s-</i> . . . . .	13-20	19-21
General conclusions to be drawn from these tables . . . . .	21	22
The testimony of the native grammarians . . . . .	22	23

### (a) ELEMENTS STANDING BEFORE THE ROOT

#### 1. *Subjective or Pronominal Prefixes*

Position and use of <i>m-</i> and <i>b-</i> . . . . .	23	25
Probable relationship of <i>m-</i> and <i>b-</i> to the suffixes <i>-ma</i> and <i>-ba</i> . . . . .	24	25
Probable demonstrative origin of both . . . . .	25	26
<i>m-</i> and the basic nature of <i>m-</i> verbs, with their frequent passage into substantival and adjectival meanings . . . . .	26	26

	SECTION	PAGE
Typical neuter (inactive intransitive) <i>m</i> - verbs . . . . .	27	30
Reflexive <i>m</i> - verbs . . . . .	28	30
<i>q</i> - as a relative of <i>b</i> - . . . . .	29	31
<i>b</i> -, <i>q</i> - verbs of typical active nature . . . . .	30	33
These active verbs usually in a group from which a member in <i>-s</i> - is absent . . . . .	31	34
<i>b</i> -, <i>q</i> - verbs of neuter (inactive intransitive) nature . . . . .	32	36
These neuter verbs as opposing partners of those in <i>-s</i> - . . . . .	33	36

## 2. Objective or Directive Infixes

The general nature and function of these elements . . . . .	34	38
<i>d</i> -, <i>g</i> -. The probability of their originally having been preceded by <i>b</i> - (as <i>bd</i> -, <i>bg</i> -) . . . . .	35	40
Their interchange with other elements . . . . .	36	40
<i>-r</i> -. As a directive element :— (a) with contact : against, upon, to, into, over, through, etc. . . . .	37	43
(b) without contact : at, towards, out, forth, away, etc. . . . .	38	44
<i>-l</i> -. As an "associative" element . . . . .	39	44
As a directive (a) with contact . . . . .	40	45
(b) without contact . . . . .	41	45
<i>-s</i> -. (a) As a general directive, terminative in force . . . . .	42	46
As a definite directive (b) towards the indirect object . . . . .	43	46
(c) towards the direct object . . . . .	44	47
Possible origin of class (c), the so-called "causative" or "transitive" verbs . . . . .	45	47
Factors which may have held some <i>-s</i> - verbs back in their old (intransitive) senses . . . . .	46	49
General consideration of the verb in both its subjective and objective connections . . . . .	47	49

## (b) ELEMENTS STANDING AFTER THE ROOT

### 1. Tense Suffixes

The suffixes <i>-s</i> and <i>-d</i> of the Perfect root . . . . .	48	56
Their probable original nature . . . . .	49	57
Derivatives from the old <i>-s</i> Perfects of :— (a) Roots originally ending in a vowel . . . . .	50	59
(b) " " " <i>-d</i> . . . . .	51	59
(c) " " " <i>-n</i> . . . . .	52	59
Derivatives from the old <i>-d</i> Perfects of :— (a) Roots originally ending in a vowel . . . . .	53	60
(b) " " " <i>-n</i> . . . . .	54	60
The tracing of original <i>-n</i> roots through surviving Perfect derivatives . . . . .	55	60
Phonetic interchanges between finals . . . . .	56	64

### 2. Non-temporal Suffixes

Possible "directive" origin of some finals . . . . .	57	66
Traces of non-temporal suffixes in :— (a) Present roots with <i>-s</i> . . . . .	58	67
(b) " " " <i>-d</i> . . . . .	59	68

## The Substantive

Elements standing before the root . . . . .	60	68
---	----	----



## Kachin

## A

	SECTION	PAGE
Original morphological equipment of the language and its later divergence from Tibetan . . . . .	61	70
Some affinities with the Tibetan dialect of Khams . . . . .	62	70
Phonetic features as compared with Tibetan . . . . .	63	70

## B

The non-pronominal prefix <i>a-</i> and its possible relationship to Tibetan 'a- . . . . .	64	71
Comparison of this prefix with various prefix usages of Assam and Burma . . . . .	65	72

## C

The pronominal element <i>ka-</i> , <i>ga-</i> of Kachin and its relatives in the Assam area . . . . .	66	73
---	----	----

### *Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

Divergences between the morphological systems of the verb in Kachin and Tibetan . . . . .	67	73
The history of Kachin verb forms with pronominal prefixes ( <i>ma-</i> ; <i>ba-</i> , <i>pa-</i> , <i>p'a-</i> ) . . . . .	68	74

(a) ELEMENTS STANDING BEFORE THE MAIN VERB ROOT

### (1) *Subjective or Pronominal Prefixes*

<i>ma-</i> . The original nature of verbs in <i>ma-</i> and their passage into substantival and adjectival meanings . .	69	76
Correspondence with (a) Tibetan <i>m-</i> . . . .	70	77
" " <i>b-, q-</i> . . . .	71	77
(b) Nâgâ forms . . . .	72	77
<i>n-</i> as a phonetic variant of <i>ma-</i> . . . .	73	79
Correspondence with (a) Tibetan <i>m-</i> . . . .	74	79
" " <i>b-, q-</i> . . . .	75	79
(b) Nâgâ and Nâgâ-Bodo forms . . . .	76	79
<i>a-</i> as a phonetic weakening of <i>ba-, pa-, pã-</i> . . . .	77	80
Correspondence with (a) Tibetan <i>b-, a-</i> . . . .	78	80
(b) Nâgâ forms . . . .	79	81
<i>ba-, pa-, pã-</i> . The original nature of verbs with this prefix and their passage into substantival and adjectival meanings . . . . .	80	82

## (2) Objective or Directive Prefixes

The various forms of these elements . . . . .	81	82
Correspondences of (a) <i>da-</i> , <i>ta-</i> , <i>fa-</i> with Tibetan <i>d-</i> . . . . .	82	83
(b) <i>ga-</i> , <i>ka-</i> , <i>ka-</i> with Tibetan <i>g-</i> . . . . .	83	83
(c) <i>la-</i> with Tibetan <i>-r-</i> (?) . . . . .	84	84
<i>la-</i> as a concord particle . . . . .	85	85
(d) <i>ša-</i> , <i>ʃa-</i> , <i>ča-</i> , <i>sa-</i> with Tibetan <i>-s-</i> . . . . .	86	85

(b) ELEMENTS STANDING AFTER THE MAIN VERB ROOT

Tabular statement of forms	87	86
The three series represented	88	89
(1) Tense elements suffixed to the main verb root	89	89
(2) Objective elements suffixed to the main verb root—		
Series (1)	90	90
Series (2)	91	90

	SECTION	PAGE
(3) Subjective elements prefixed to the auxiliary —		
Series (1) . . . . .	92	90
Series (2) . . . . .	93	91
Series (3) . . . . .	94	91
<i>The Substantive</i>		
Elements standing before the root . . . . .	95	91
<b>THE LANGUAGES OF ASSAM AND BURMA</b>		
The break between these languages and Tibetan and the lateness of the prefix usages of this area . . . . .	96	93
<b>I. The Bodo, Nâgâ and Nâgâ-Bodo Languages</b>		
A		
Surviving remnants of the old Tibetan pronominal prefixes (Series 0), and directive infixes of the verb, found in these languages . . . . .	97	96
Replacement of the old directive infixes before the verb by similar elements after it . . . . .	98	97
The 3rd personal (demonstrative) prefixes (Series I) now characteristic of verbal derivatives in this region . . . . .	99	97
Their cognate demonstratives in Tibetan . . . . .	100	98
The origin of the first personal pronouns in this area . . . . .	101	99
The younger 3rd personal (demonstrative) prefixes (Series II) with substantives . . . . .	102	100
The non-pronominal vocalic prefix with substantives and its confusion with members of Series II . . . . .	103	101
Table of successive prefixes (Series 0 to Series III) in the languages of this area . . . . .	104	103
B		
Construction of adjectives; older and newer methods . . . . .	105	106
Uppgrowth of the method of forming them with prefixed 3rd personal demonstratives and the import of this develop- ment in the historical unfoldment of these languages . . . . .	106	108
C		
Uncertainty of consonantal and tonic equations between these languages and Tibetan . . . . .	107	109
<b>A. BODO LANGUAGES</b>		
<i>Bârâ</i>		
Preliminary . . . . .	108	110
Personal Pronouns . . . . .	109	110
Demonstrative Pronouns . . . . .	110	111
<i>Morphological Accretions of the Verb</i>		
(a) BEFORE THE ROOT		
1. <i>ma-</i> , <i>mi-</i> of Series 0 . . . . .	111	111
2. <i>ga-</i> of Series I . . . . .	112	111
3. The Causative Prefix <i>fu-</i> , <i>fi-</i> . . . . .	113	111

## SECTION PAGE

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	114	112
2. The Causative Infix -hũ- . . . . .	115	113

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

1. bĩ- of Series II not a permanently adhering element . . . . .	116	113
--	-----	-----

*Dîmă-să*

Preliminary . . . . .	117	113
Personal Pronouns . . . . .	118	115
Demonstrative Pronouns . . . . .	119	116

*Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

## (a) BEFORE THE ROOT

1. ma-, mĩ-, mǎ- of Series 0 . . . . .	120	116
2. ga-, gě-, gĩ-, gǎ-, gũ- of Series I . . . . .	121	117
3. The Causative Prefix pũ-, pũ- . . . . .	122	117

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	123	117
2. Directive Infixes . . . . .	124	118
3. The Causative Infix -rĩ- . . . . .	125	118

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

1. ba-, bě-, bĩ-, bǎ-, bũ- of Series II . . . . .	126	118
---	-----	-----

*Gârô*

Preliminary . . . . .	127	119
Personal Pronouns . . . . .	128	121
Demonstrative Pronouns . . . . .	129	121

*Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

## (a) BEFORE THE ROOT

1. gi- of Series I . . . . .	130	122
------------------------------	-----	-----

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	131	123
2. Directive Infixes . . . . .	132	124
3. The Causative Infix -ât- . . . . .	133	125

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

The lack of these prefixes in this language . . . . .	134	125
---	-----	-----

## B. CENTRAL NÂGÂ LANGUAGES

Preliminary . . . . .	135	125
-----------------------	-----	-----

*Áo Nágá*

Personal Pronouns . . . . .	136	126
Demonstrative Pronouns . . . . .	137	127

*Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

## (a) BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>me-</i> of Series 0 . . . . .	138	128
2. <i>á-</i> of Series 0 . . . . .	139	129
3. <i>te-</i> of Series I . . . . .	140	133

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	141	134
2. Directive Infixes . . . . .	142	136
3. The Causative Infix <i>-dák-tsa-</i> . . . . .	143	139

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>me-, mo-, mu-</i> . . . . .	144	139
2. <i>te-</i> of Series I . . . . .	145	140
The prefix <i>te-, de</i> of Jyarung and its identity with Áo Nágá <i>te-</i> . . . . .	146	141

*Lhôtá Nágá*

Personal Pronouns . . . . .	147	144
Demonstrative Pronouns . . . . .	148	145

*Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

## (a) BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>m-, n-</i> of Series 0 . . . . .	149	145
2. <i>e-</i> of Series 0 . . . . .	150	147
Tendency of <i>e-</i> forms to lapse into substantives and adjectives . . . . .	151	148
3. Directive Elements . . . . .	152	149

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	153	151
2. Directive Infixes . . . . .	154	151
3. The Causative Infix <i>-tók-</i> . . . . .	155	152

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>m-, n-</i> . . . . .	156	152
2. <i>ó-</i> of Series II . . . . .	157	152

## C. NÁGÁ-BODO LANGUAGES

*Mikir*

Personal Pronouns . . . . .	158	154
Demonstrative Pronouns . . . . .	159	155

## SECTION PAGE

*Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

## (a) BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>in-</i> of Series 0 . . . . .	160	155
The prefix <i>in-</i> of Central Chin and Old Kuki and its identity with Mikir <i>in-</i> . . . . .	161	159
2. <i>ke-, ki-, ká-</i> of Series I . . . . .	162	160
3. <i>á-</i> of Series II . . . . .	163	161
4. The Directive Infix <i>-r-</i> . . . . .	164	161
The Infix <i>-rr-, -r-, -rá-, -ro-</i> of Old Kuki and its identity with Mikir <i>-r-</i> . . . . .	165	164
5. The Reflexive Infix <i>-či-, -če-</i> . . . . .	166	165
6. The Causative Element <i>pe-, pi-, pá-</i> . . . . .	167	166

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	168	166
2. Directive Infixes . . . . .	169	167

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>in-</i> . . . . .	170	168
2. The Infix <i>-r-</i> with substantives . . . . .	171	168
3. <i>á-</i> of Series II . . . . .	172	170

*Êmpêo or Kachchâ Nâgâ*

Preliminary . . . . .	173	170
Personal Pronouns . . . . .	174	172
Demonstrative Pronouns . . . . .	175	172

*Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

## (a) BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>en-</i> of Series 0 . . . . .	176	172
2. The Directive Element <i>ra-</i> . . . . .	177	173

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	178	173
2. The Causative Infix <i>-pé-</i> . . . . .	179	173

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>en-, hen-</i> . . . . .	180	174
2. <i>ba-, bá-</i> of Series II . . . . .	181	174
3. <i>mi-</i> ("man") as a prefix . . . . .	182	174

## II. The Kuki-Chin Languages

## A

The pronominal material of this area . . . . .	183	175
The pronominal prefix <i>ka-, ká-</i> of Series I: a link with the Nâgâ group . . . . .	184	176
The probable nature and origin of the pronominal prefix <i>a-</i> of Series II, and its confusion with a non-pronominal element of similar form . . . . .	185	177
The distinction between this prefix in Kuki-Chin and Burmese . . . . .	186	179

	SECTION	PAGE
The probable nature and origin of the second element <i>-ma</i> (Series II) of the typical Kuki-Chin 3rd personal pronoun	187	180
Table of successive prefixes (Series 0 to Series III) in these languages . . . . .	188	181

## B

The directive infixes of Kuki-Chin . . . . .	189	184
Fully expanded verb forms of this group . . . . .	190	184

## A. NORTHERN CHIN

*Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

## (a) BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>ka-</i> of Series I . . . . .	191	185
2. <i>a-</i> of Series II . . . . .	192	185
3. Traces of the ancient system of directives . . . . .	193	185
4. The newer directive infixes replacing them . . . . .	194	186
5. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	195	186
6. The Causative Infix . . . . .	196	187

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	197	187
2. Causative Infixes . . . . .	198	187

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>ka-</i> , <i>ká-</i> , <i>ke-</i> of Series I . . . . .	199	188
2. <i>a-</i> of Series II . . . . .	200	188

## B. CENTRAL CHIN

*Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

## (a) BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>ká-</i> of Series I . . . . .	201	189
2. <i>a-</i> of Series II . . . . .	202	189
3. Directive Infixes . . . . .	203	189
4. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	204	190

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . .	205	191
2. Causative Infixes . . . . .	206	192

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

1. <i>ká-</i> , <i>ké-</i> of Series I . . . . .	207	192
2. <i>pa-</i> (of Series II ?) . . . . .	208	193
3. <i>a-</i> of Series II . . . . .	209	194

## C. SOUTHERN CHIN

Preliminary . . . . .	210	194
-----------------------	-----	-----

*Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

## (a) BEFORE THE ROOT

1. *a-* of Series II . . . . . 211 194

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . . 212 195  
 2. The Causative Infix . . . . . 213 195

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

1. *a-* of Series II . . . . . 214 195

## III. Burmese

## A

- On certain points of transliteration . . . . . 215 196

## B

- The non-pronominal prefix *a-* and its connections in Kachin  
 and Tibetan . . . . . 216 198

*Morphological Accretions of the Verb*

## (a) BEFORE THE ROOT

1. Possibility of the original possession of subject prefixes . 217 199  
 2. Evidence of former directive infixes; comparison with  
 Kachin . . . . . 218 199

## (b) AFTER THE ROOT

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes . . . . . 219 201  
 2. The Causative Infix . . . . . 220 202

*Morphological Accretions of the Substantive*

## BEFORE THE ROOT

1. *a-*, non-pronominal . . . . . 221 202

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 203

ABBREVIATIONS . . . . . 215





## INTRODUCTION

### A

§ 1. The preliminary sketch here attempted of the mechanism of Tibeto-Burman linguistic morphology has led to the placing of the so-called "prefixed letters" of Tibetan in what may at first appear a strange light.

Concerned primarily with discovering, if possible, the pre-classical development which has given us a written form for this language of so stiffly frozen a lexical character, the results set forth in this part of the investigation have grown, almost perforce, out of the evidence furnished by the younger languages of Assam and Burma,<sup>1</sup> by which by no means the least important evidence has been furnished.

And it is in Tibetan more especially that the writer's view differs from others hitherto advanced, especially in the case of the verb.

Generally, it has been considered that because a morphological element, a prefix for instance, occurs in the written language preponderatingly with causative or transitive verbs, that it is itself a formative element by means of which such verbs are built up from roots of an originally different nature.

But is this necessarily so? We have in the Tibetan written

<sup>1</sup> It need hardly be stated here that the language groups represented in the present work have been chosen for the specific reason that they preserve what has elsewhere been lost, i.e. traces of the old Tibeto-Burman flexible morphological system.

In the Lo-lo and Mo-so groups, which have sometimes (as by Maspero, *Le Dialecte de T'ch'ang-ngan sous les T'ang*, BEFEO., t. xx, No. 2, p. 22, n. 1) been regarded as forming a more typical Tibeto-Burman group with Tibetan and Burmese, we find only a continuation of the fixed word forms as found in Tibetan, and a consequent lack of morphological elements, though these languages are probably more valuable than those of the Assam area for any investigation of the development of tones. For our present purposes, however, they offer comparatively little.

The Tibeto-Burman languages of the Assam and adjacent areas are not a medley in the extreme sense which Maspero (*loc. cit.*) appears to believe. Their structure has not been borrowed or basically changed, and though often presenting a strange front to one more familiar with the more rigid Lo-lo and Mo-so groups, investigation soon shows that their morphology is not foreign to their own family, borrowings being limited (except in certain instances with which we have no concern here) to their vocabularies.

language a record of word forms as extant only as far back as the seventh century, when the language had already reached a stage in which the old prefixes, infixes, and suffixes were frozen permanently upon the roots. Obviously a long historical development must have already preceded this, for one can hardly believe that it was the original condition. And it is just this historical development which it has been the writer's aim to discover.

We know that a language which is now rapidly changing may have previously stood almost still for centuries, and we know that a young and, at present, changing language, or group of languages, may, due to this former stagnation, still preserve peculiar grammatical, lexical, or morphological principles which are older or more complete in form than the corresponding principles of the older languages which are now stagnant.

And just for this reason we can recover much of the old Tibeto-Burman verb mechanism from the younger languages.

It appears, for instance, that when we find in the Kuki-Chin group, at present quite unstable, and evidently going back at no very distant date to a common ancestor, a well-defined and regularly employed verbal mechanism: Subject Prefix + Directive Infix + Root + Adverbial Infix + Tense Suffix, we are probably in the presence of a principle which the parent language had preserved and passed on to its successors in the following period of change.

And just this mechanism is what we meet with on every hand. It is not always so complete, naturally, sometimes preserving only Subject Prefix + Root + Adverbial Infix + Tense Suffix; or, again, Directive Element (originally infix) + Root + Adverbial Infix + Tense Suffix, or other <sup>1</sup> incomplete remnant, but it is always the same system.

And it is remarkable how exactly Tibetan corresponds. Thus, with its written verb forms, a variety of circumstances point to the four "roots" as representing a single originally unified block: Subject Prefix (*b-*) + Directive Infix (*-r-*, *-l-*, *-s-*, and possibly *-d-*, and *-g-*) + Root + Tense Suffix; or Subject Prefix (*m-* or *b-*) + Root + Tense Suffix, which differs from the forms of the younger languages only in not including an Adverbial Infix between the Root and the Tense Suffix. This insertion (the only departure the younger

<sup>1</sup> Compare the formula given for Chutiyâ in Brown's *Outline Grammar of the Deori Chutiyâ Language*, p. 22.

languages show from Tibetan), is, however, only the natural result of the introduction in them of an auxiliary verb for tense less closely attached to the root than the original suffixes, which they have obviously displaced.

And so it arrives that the verbs of Tibetan in their "Infinitive", or sometimes only in their so-called "Future" forms, when not exhibiting *m-*, *a-*, or *b-*, alone as a prefix, have specific "directive" values,<sup>1</sup> the old infixes *-r-*, *-l-*, *-s-*, *-d-*, *-g-* still standing, but now often alone, before the root, just as in Latin *in-*, *ad-*, *a-* (also "directive" particles) so frequently did.

They come very generally indeed under the same heads:—

(1) Direction *at* or *towards* (*terminus ad quem*), with or without motion = *at*, *to*, *towards*, *for*; *rgyug-pa* to run, to hasten or rush *at*, *to*, or *towards* (*accurrere*); *lia-ba* to be situated, directed, or oriented *towards*, to look or face *towards* (*aspectare*); *sgrog-pa* to call out *to*, to shout *at* (*advocare*); *dgos-pa* to be in want of, to wish *for* (*adpetere*); *gtod-pa* to direct or turn *towards* (*advertere*).

(2) Direction *to* or *into* (*terminus in quo*), with or without motion = *to*, *in*, *into*, *upon*; *rdebs-pa* to throw or cast *upon* or *into* (*injacere*); *lia-ba* to investigate, to examine, to look *into* (*inspectare*); *sbor-ba*, *sbar-ba* to set fire *to* (*incendere*); *dgar-ba* to confine, to pen up *in*, or *into*, (*includere*); *adzugs-pa* (Fut. *gzugs*) to prick or stick *into*, to pierce, to plant (*inserere*, *infodere*), to put or place *on* or *upon* (*imponere*), to lay out (a garden), to found (a town) (*instituere*), to cling *to*, to stick *to*, to hold fast *to* (*inhaerere*); *gzer-ba* to bore *into*, to drive or knock *into* (*infigere*), etc., etc.

Perhaps also the parallel was even more complete with:—

(3) Direction *out from* (*terminus a quo*): *spon-ba*, *span-ba* to give up, to renounce, to abstain *from* (*abstinere*), and

(4) Locative of accompaniment: *ldan-pa* to be near or close *beside* (*adesse*).

The mechanism that we can thus recover is, indeed, one eminently suitable for the language, and would have provided its sentences in ancient times with just that clarity which the case suffixes alone now so often fail to convey.

In thus attempting to illumine from a historical angle the

<sup>1</sup> It must not be understood from this that the system is still operating. It is not. The statement simply is, that the verb root provided with the prefixed element has still, as a whole, so well developed a sense of direction that the original force of the prefixed element can hardly be in doubt. Compare § 10.

morphology of written Tibetan as we have it in the texts, and to recover the probable state of the language prior to its passage into the known fixed forms found there, the writer has taken the language in this written form and attempted to work out the processes which have led to the upgrowth of the various morphological usages found now in the younger languages.

And it is not the immediately related dialects of Tibetan itself which show these. Those languages which exhibit a definite growth which will explain the written forms of Tibetan, and offer developments which, as the writer hopes he has shown, carry on in the same direct line the old morphological formations that occur, but in non-functioning form, in Tibetan, are definitely outside that area, and it would appear that sighting back over successive established stages in the morphological functioning of these languages we are brought directly to a point in Tibetan where that language was still flexible in its own morphology, and had not yet started that breakdown which finally caused its old mechanism to become inoperative and stiffly frozen some time before the language was reduced to writing.

The result has yielded what appears to have been the morphological apparatus of "proto-Tibetan", and allows the language a kind of revivifying process, in which one can see it break away from its stiffly frozen prefix usages of the classical age, and stand out again, as in an earlier stage, a much more flexible form of speech, so much more precise in meaning, and so much better adapted for expressing minute shades of thought, particularly in the verb, that it appears doubly improbable that too much weight should be attached to the always stiffly frozen surface manifestations of the written language. For the first time, I believe, we have here an interpretation of the Tibetan verb which leaves no case unexplained.

For the difficulty which confronts one everywhere in the Indo-Chinese region, that while an element (prefix or infix) seems to be connected with a very definite sense in one direction, frequently occurs in connection with just the reverse,<sup>1</sup> is understandable, since a directive element is as much the property of an intransitive as a transitive, as much

<sup>1</sup> A peculiarly persistent feature. It appears again in the Môn-Khmér family. See, for instance, Schmidt, *Die Sprachen der Sakei und Semang auf Malacca*, p. 574.

the property of an active as a causative verb. It can occur with each one, but need not occur with any.

§ 2. We thus, in fact, have what is practically the reverse of the causative-denominative idea,<sup>1</sup> as the prefixes or infixes do not, in the writer's view, appear to be in any sense formatives employed to mould the verb into a transitive, causative, or other form, or the substantive into a verb, but on the contrary, the verb root stands out as having moulded the directive elements into the *appearance* (but only the appearance) of being transitive or causative formatives, through having drawn upon them in such a regular way to show its objective connection in the ancient language when the verb root was desired to express a transitive or causative sense.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, the reverse cases, where the verb is intransitive, the prefix (really infix) is no formative. Thus, through *association* such elements have assumed the colour of their surroundings.

## B

§ 3. The view<sup>3</sup> that Indo-Chinese languages now devoid of prefixes need not be regarded as having ever possessed them, the writer can share only if we limit the definition of "prefix" to an unvocalized permanent accretion of forgotten meaning. In many cases it is doubtless then true, more especially in the Siamese-Chinese family.

But is it not possible that anciently, the whole Indo-Chinese family may have possessed, in its essentials at least, a common flexible morphological prefix system, at any rate with the verb?

To the writer it seems that this possibility should at least not be denied, and that so far as we can see, such elements, in their older form and more loosely attached use, may once have occurred in what are to-day the very most broken-down and "isolating" of these languages. That all remnants of such elements are now so entirely lacking in these latter can surely be nothing against this view, but is, indeed, rather evidence that any morphological system which in ancient times they may have possessed, was actually of this flexible order, the easy detachability accompanying which, would lead to

<sup>1</sup> See especially A. Conrady, *Eine indo-chinesische Causativ-Denominativ-Bildung und ihr Zusammenhang mit den Tonaccenten*, Leipzig, 1896.

<sup>2</sup> See especially § 47 (pp. 49-56).

<sup>3</sup> v. Laufer, *Si-Hia*, pp. 114-15.

their being cast off before they had time to become permanently glued on.

Thus it is the writer's belief that while the lack of prefixes is now complete in the Siamese-Chinese family, our inability to recover anything more than initial consonant clusters is not evidence that this group never possessed anything beyond these clusters, or that it should be regarded as never having been equipped with any system of prefixed elements after the Tibetan fashion, but is rather suggestive of the possibility of the former occurrence of freely flexible and easily detachable elements, evidence for the former existence of which in the related Tibeto-Burman family is so abundant.

That we can adduce evidence from the Siamese-Chinese field itself in support of former prefixes can hardly be denied.

In Chinese itself, Conrady's pioneer effort<sup>1</sup> started out on the right road. The force of utterance of verb root initials (sonant, surd, aspirate), varying, even though not always regularly, with the verbal force (neuter, intransitive, transitive or causative) is, indeed, a clue which could very well indicate the former presence of prefixed particles to accomplish the same end, and may also very well be evidence that the attachment between such supposed morphological elements and the root, was of just that order which would result from a root which could never appear in composition without them.<sup>2</sup>

At least, it is probably legitimate for us to suppose that the anciently greater freedom of use and looseness of connection of the prefixed particles with the following root, which the writer has outlined in the following pages for Tibeto-Burman, might lend support to the view that once they may have existed in similarly loose adherence in the Chinese and Tai fields.

§ 4. Connected intimately with this is the differing word order as between the Siamese-Chinese and Tibeto-Burman families, for it is likely enough that many of the most profound changes which Indo-Chinese has undergone in its eastern area, are traceable to the breakdown of some early morphological mechanism. For it is an accepted fact that the rigid word order of Chinese is not original, but is the result of the

<sup>1</sup> *CB.*, pp. 158-77. Since this early attempt, the subject has not been approached again from this angle. We may, however, be coming round to it again. See Pelliot, T'oung Pao, xxii (1923), pp. 359-62.

<sup>2</sup> See § 11 *in extr.*

loss of some other means of expressing grammatical and syntactical relations.<sup>1</sup>

And just as in Tibetan, the ancient morphological apparatus of the verb, instead of being cast off while yet in its free and fluid state, became permanently frozen, finally in unvocalized form, onto the following root, where it persists to this day as the so-called "prefixed letters", so is in Tibetan, and its immediate relatives, the oldest word order probably retained. For there is evidence from many sources that the end of the sentence is the logical position for a verb which reflects from its surface by means of attached particles its connections in space and time with its subject and object, in the form of what might be called a "recapitulating" verb. This appears very frequently in quite unrelated fields, among others, to quote a late instance, in many American-Indian languages, and again, as a very old example, in Sumerian.

Thus, whether we should take all together the varying evidence of the Tibeto-Burman and Chinese-Tai languages, as indicating a former greater freedom of the word order,<sup>2</sup> in which subject, verb, object, was a sequence running parallel with one of subject, object, verb, is to be doubted, notwithstanding the fact that this would give us a unified complex type from which both these language groups could very well have descended.

§ 5. Indeed, we actually have within the Tibeto-Burman family many well-marked changes of thought-sequence which give the type which these languages represent the appearance of being, potentially at least, that from which those of the Chinese-Tai family might have originated.

Thus the regularly developed tendency to move the directive particle connecting the verb with its object from a position before to a position after the verb root, which results—when subjective prefixes still remain in the language—in a sequence

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Jespersen, *Language*, pp. 371-2; Conrady, *Der altchinesische Fragesatz und der steigende Ton*, Mitt. d. Sem. f. Orient. Sprachen, Berlin, Jhrg. xviii (1915), pp. 261-4.

<sup>2</sup> Compare *inter alia*: Kuhn, *Über Herkunft und Sprache der transgangetischen Völker*, Festrede, Münchener Akademie, 1883, pp. 10-13 (esp. 12-13); Grube, *Die Sprachgeschichtliche Stellung des Chinesischen*, p. 8; Conrady, *Eine Indochinesische Causativ-Denominativ Bildung*, pp. 44-5; Grierson, *Notes on Ahom*, ZDMG., Bd. 56 (1902), p. 26; Conrady, *Der altchinesische Fragesatz und der steigende Ton*, Mit. Sem. Or. Spr., Berlin, 1915, pp. 261-4.

of: subjective particle + verb + objective (directive) particle, shows clearly that these languages are well able to develop the thought-sequence which is typical of the Chinese-Tai family

The thought-sequences of Tibeto-Burman are also instructive in other respects.

The genius of the family calls for the generalized term to appear first. This is then modified by following additions: the adjective, or so-called, "case" suffix after the substantive, the temporal element (and this only, at first) after the verb, the particular object possessed after the possessor (our so-called "genitive").

With this the placing of the verb at the end of the sentence is evidently in accord. It may perhaps be regarded as a species of limiting thought, singling out the particular act or movement performed, from among a number of possible acts or movements, any one of which the previously named actors could have accomplished.

On this supposition the psychology of the directive "infix" becomes clear. It is a restatement of the general movement indicated in the earlier part of the sentence, made for the purpose of its immediate closer definition by the following verb.

The same predilection for this general to particular sequence is almost certainly the reason for the frequent placing in the Tai group of the genitive in an adjectival (following) position, an occurrence of great frequency in some particular languages.

In fact, there is basically, in such cases, no outward distinction drawn; "my servant" is then treated as "the me servant", an adjectival construction exactly coinciding with "the good servant", in each instance the limiting idea (me, good) assuming last place.

This is particularly well in evidence in Ahom,<sup>1</sup> where frequently the pronoun (possessive) is suffixed and indistinguishable in position and mode of use from an adjective. The genitive substantive follows even more regularly, and coincides thus actually more completely still with adjectival usage. *kip kau* is actually no more "husk of rice" (genitive) than "rice husk" (adjectival).

Nor is this in opposition *basically* to the Tibeto-Burman order, in which the object possessed, and not the possessor,

<sup>1</sup> See Grierson, *Notes on Ahom*, ZDMG., Bd. 56 (1902), pp. 17-19.



is regarded as the limiting term, and follows. In each case the *basic* reasoning is evidently from general to particular.

The order in the Tai field arises doubtless from the preceding genitive's having held a weaker position than the adjective following its noun, the more strongly entrenched adjective having thus been able to draw the genitive into its own position.

In Tibetan we have the reverse process, the adjective in the colloquial being drawn into the preceding position peculiar to the genitive, and being, in fact, construed as a genitive.

What conclusions we might be justified in drawing from these considerations is still a matter of some doubt.

It is noticeable, however, that it is in the Chinese-Tai family that we encounter all the more definite departures from those thought-sequences (as reflected in word order) which, so long as a living morphological system remains in any appreciable degree, appear to be *basic* in the Indo-Chinese field.

This fact suggests that the Chinese-Tai family has moved further away from the parent form than Tibeto-Burman, and that at the base of each was originally a well-defined word order following more closely that of Tibeto-Burman, as we know it, than that of the former family.

With the summary of conclusions reached by Schmidt<sup>1</sup> as to primitive word order the writer fully agrees. In the Indo-Chinese field, at least, they apply particularly well.

It appears to him, however, that they should be attributed to a somewhat different psychological background.

Schmidt's statement (*op. cit.*, p. 488) that the original genitive probably preceded the object possessed because it is the *differentia specifica*, the qualifying term, to which it is desired to impart emphasis, creating, as it does, a "species" out of the "genus" represented by the following substantive, is to the writer's mind quite a mistake.

It is most certainly not a "psychological necessity", for then the adjective, which is a similar limiting term, would have to stand first also.

It appears rather to the writer that the genitive itself should be regarded as the "genus", the object possessed (out of many possible objects) as the "*differentia specifica*", and we then have the substantive which follows the genitive and the adjective which follows the substantive appearing clearly in the same light, and probably felt to be more interdependent than Schmidt (p. 490) believes. Each is a limiting term, which stands last in a system of reasoning from general to particular.

We then do not have to regard the subject standing before the verb in a different light from the genitive standing before its substantive (p. 489), for rather than the genitive's being the psychologically new idea as against the subject's being the known originator or first existing cause of the verbal action, the genitive appears, like the subject,

<sup>1</sup> *Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde*, pp. 488-91.

as the already existing general term limited by the following object possessed (from among a number of possible objects), just as the subject is limited by the following verb to one certain act (from among a number of possible acts).

## C

§ 6. The writer has been compelled, especially in considering the younger languages of the Bodo, Nâgâ, Kuki-Chin, and related groups, to introduce a great deal of material properly belonging in systematic grammars of the various individual languages, as the Outline Grammars which have up until now appeared have been, in most cases, somewhat confusingly written.

This applies particularly to the directive and descriptive adverbial infixes, a detailed study of which, enclosed as they are between the pronominal prefixes and the root on the one hand, and the tense indices and the root on the other, is naturally of the first importance to any understanding of the way these languages have developed along these lines compared with Tibetan, and to get a clearer view of the nature of the expanded verbal block in them, i.e. :—

Subjective	Directive	Verb	Descriptive	Tense
Pronominal Prefix	+ (orig. case)	+ Root	+ Adverbial Infix	+ Suffix
	Infix			

If then, this material's having been given in full shall have served only in clarifying our understanding of these languages within themselves, the writer will feel that the space has not been wasted.

Also, by paying more particular attention to certain selected representative languages among the better-known ones, a clearer view can be obtained of the group as a whole to which they belong. The interpretation of the remaining languages not dealt with here, then, in most cases presents but small difficulty, as their various elements (prefixes and infixes) fall naturally into place.

The classification of the Linguistic Survey of India has been followed, and attention called when necessary, to any anomalous features in the individual languages or language groups. The affinity between some of the Old Kuki languages (in the Kuki-Chin group) and Mikir (Nâgâ-Bodo sub-group) has, for instance, been specially treated (§§ 161, 165 ; and cf. LSI., iii, 3, p. 15), as it forms an important link between the northern and southern subdivisions of the languages of this area.

A word seems necessary in extenuation of the term "infix" in the Tibeto-Burman languages.

Though not used in its accepted sense to designate an insertion into the body of the root, yet the elements so named here are in so far infixes that they were originally (and are still normally) always compelled to stand between a separable prefix and the root. Between these two they had to be inserted, or else not used at all.

It is hoped, therefore, that the term "infix" is not altogether unsuitable, as eliminate this, and we have only somewhat cumbersome circumlocutions to use. The word has already been employed in this sense by Brown.<sup>1</sup>

§ 7. In the matter of transliteration only the following need be noted.

"a" has been retained for the colourless vowel sound in the Assam and Burma area.

"â" is employed for the sound of "aw" in "flaw".

Though the writer is not satisfied with either of these transcriptions, he has thought it best to follow current usage. The indefinite writing "a" probably covers several distinct shades of sound, but it is impossible to disentangle these with the meagre information at present at our disposal as to the phonology of these languages. "â" should be replaced by some modification of "o", its nearest relative, but "â" has been so frequently used now that the writer has retained it. At least, it is a single letter for a simple sound, a principle to which he has adhered as far as possible throughout.

Other than this, the system does not need any special remark, except to say that it has been applied as consistently as possible in a field full of all kinds of monstrosities<sup>2</sup> of spelling.

Particular transcriptions for individual languages are noted under such languages.

<sup>1</sup> *Outline Grammar of the Deori Chutiya Language*, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> The Nâgâ, Bodo, Kuki-Chin and intermediate groups give particular trouble in this respect. The vowels, especially, are vague. In addition to the mixture of sounds in "a", "ai" is probably in many cases intended for "ê" instead of "ai" as in "aisle", "ô" for "â" instead of "ô" in "go", and so on. In view of the confusion reigning in this area, it is hoped that the inconsistencies which will doubtless be found may be excused.

## TIBETAN PRELIMINARY

### A

§ 8. Naturally Tibetan in its written form approaches more closely than any other member of the family the hypothetical original Tibeto-Burman form of speech. It is characteristic that it not only preserves the old directive infixes with the verb, but also has in the case (directive) suffixes of the substantive the elements the force of which they repeated.

That a certain amount of shifting had already taken place among these prefixed elements (*d-*, *g-*, *r-*, *l-*, *s-*) before the language was first given a written form is fairly certain, as there was at that time an already strictly followed sequence<sup>1</sup> limiting the employment of each prefix to certain initials according to the dictates of euphony.<sup>2</sup> The upgrowth of this was evidently due originally to the prefixed elements losing their vowels, and thereby bringing their consonants in direct contact with those of the root initial, the unpleasant clash resulting from which led, in many cases, to a change in the consonantal prefix.

We have examples of this in the younger languages. While in Âo Nâgâ, for instance, the vocalized prefixes *me-* with verbs, and *me-*, *mo-*, *mu-* (vowel harmony forms) with substantives, can occur before any initial, Lhôtâ Nâgâ, which merges two distinct prefixes into one unvocalized form, has

<sup>1</sup> The evidence of early texts goes definitely to show that these are not original to the language. Usages are frequent in, for instance, the sgraffiti at Endere, which later became quite outlawed. There is thus *rk* in *rkol* (v. Stein, *Anc. Khotan*, i, p. 569), and in a document, *gls* in *glsuñ* (op. cit., p. 563), which are in line with the evidence of *b-* before the aspirated initials *ts* and *č* (v. op. cit., pp. 562-3) as indicating a former more free and flexible state of the language in this regard. Compare especially Francke, JRAS., 1914, pp. 57-8.

<sup>2</sup> A deeper study of the differing ideas as to what is called for by euphony in different dialects, and again at different periods within the same dialect, would be well worth undertaking.

The departure, for instance, of the present day spoken language of Khams in harmonizing the prefix *a-* of the written forms with the class of the following initial, so that *a-* becomes *n-* before *k* and *g*, *n-* before *č*, *ś*, *ł*, *d*, *ts*, *dz*, and *m-* before *p* and *b* (v. Jaschke, *Dic.*, xvi-xxi) practically reverses the system, and by calling for a guttural before gutturals, a dental before palatals, dentals, and dental sibilants, and a labial before labials, substitutes class agreement between prefix and initial instead of the contrasts of the written language. Compare Kachin §§ 62, 73, Lhôtâ Nâgâ, §§ 149, 156.

developed a variant *n-* for use before dentals, gutturals, and palatals, retaining *m-* only before labials (v. §§ 149, 156). No other language, in fact, of the groups here treated, seems to approach Tibetan in any degree in the strictness of the phonetic laws regulating the employment of prefixes, a fact evidently due to the almost universal intervention of a vowel.

§ 9. How rigidly Tibetan was ruled by the laws of euphony at least twelve hundred years ago is attested by the native grammarians, a brief survey of the phonetic system propounded by whom may be given here.<sup>1</sup>

First, as purely relative designations for the harshness and softness of letters they employed the terms *po* "masculine" and *mo* "feminine".<sup>2</sup>

Next, widely speaking, articulate speech sounds are divided into *gsal byed*, or consonants, which are called *po* "masculine" (i.e. harsh), and *dbyanis*, or vowels, designated as *mo* "feminine" (i.e. soft).

Then again, the consonants are taken alone and divided

<sup>1</sup> See especially *Si-tui sum-rtags* (*rTags ajug-gi agrel-ba*), reprinted by Sarat Chandra Das in his *Tibetan Grammar* (Book ii, pp. 32 *et seqq.*). The statement made by that author (*op. cit.*, p. v), that the hardness and softness of Tibetan letters indicated by gender terms "is due to the place of their origin" is obviously an error, and is curious in the face of the statements in the *rTags ajug-pa*. The meaning of the commentator's remarks there is rather to the effect that as the *min gzi* letters are grouped as *po*, and so forth, according to their characteristics (*rgyu-mtsan*), it is essential to understand that the letters when pronounced alone (i.e. apart from words), at the guttural, dental, labial, palatal, and so on, points of formation (*skye gnas*), are classified (as *po*, etc.) on account of the degree (*ce-cun*) or relative harshness (*grims-lhod*) of the force of their utterance, those which are of great or hard force being placed together as *po*, those which are "proportionate" (*ran-pa*) as *ma nin*, those which are of but small or easy force as *mo*, those still softer or easier *sin-tu mo*, while those which are extremely soft and weak are classed as *mo gšam*. (v. *Si-tui sum-rtags* (*rTags ajug-pa*), pp. 37-8, in Book ii of the *Grammar* above quoted.)

<sup>2</sup> This very natural analogy seems also to have been employed by the ancient Sumerian grammarians. It gives us then a plausible explanation of the *eme sal* forms (v. Delitzsch, *Sum. Gr.*, pp. 20-3). For *eme sal* or "woman's tongue" would be a very suitable term for the special word forms it designates, since as their outstanding features they exhibit substitution of initial *m* for *g*, *š* for *n*, *z* for *s*, medial *m* for *g*, *d* for *g*, and final *b* for *g*, in all but one of which the characteristic *eme sal* sound is weaker, and in that one case (*d* for *g*) the distinction seems to lie in the comparatively softer sound of the dentals than the gutturals as a class.

What renders this interpretation of *eme sal* even more probable is the substitute term *eme te-ná*, as the root *ten* has the sense of "to rest or calm oneself", or (what is more to the point in the present instance) vb. caus. "to bring under control, to bring to rest, to quiet" (v. Delitzsch, *Sum. Glossar*, p. 159), with evident reference to the "quieted" consonant. *m*, *š*, *z*, *d*, *b*. Compare also Prince, *Materials for a Sumerian Lexicon*, p. xiv.

apparently <sup>1</sup> into two large groups, one of which is masculine, the other feminine. Under the masculine head fall the *tenues aspiratae* (*ma nin* "sterile" (male)) and the surds or *tenues* (*p'o*), while feminine are the sonants or *mediae*, together with *š*, *s*, *ž*, *z*, *y*, *w*, *a* (*mo*), the nasals (*šin-tu mo* "very feminine"), and the liquids *r* and *l*, with *h* (*mo gšam* "barren" (female)).

This may be shown as follows, adding the tone (pitch = Tibetan *skad* "voice") class to which, as initials, they now belong.

High Tone ( <i>mo skad</i> )		Low Tone ( <i>p'o skad</i> )			
<i>ma nin</i>	<i>p'o</i>	<i>mo</i>		<i>šin-tu mo</i>	<i>mo gšam</i>
<i>k</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>g</i> <i>a</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>h</i>
<i>č</i>	<i>č</i>		<i>ž</i> <i>y</i>	<i>ñ</i>	
<i>ts</i>	<i>ts</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>dz</i> <i>z</i>		
<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>		<i>d</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>r, l</i>
<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>		<i>b</i> <i>w</i>	<i>m</i>	

As alternative terms we have also *ran-pa* lit. "proportionate", *drag-pa* "strong", *žan-pa* "weak", *mšam-pa* "even, level, flat", as designations of the sound quality <sup>2</sup> of the first four of the above five classes.

<sup>1</sup> The correctness of this larger classification depends upon the interpretation of *ma nin* as "sterile" (a sterile male), in place of "neuter", the general reading. This can hardly be in doubt, as the additional senses of "impotent, unable to beget", clearly show. *ma nin* would then have been regarded as standing at the opposite end of the chain from *mo gšam* "barren" (female), in spite of its being placed by the native grammarians as second (under influence of the arrangement of the alphabet). The only actually "neuter" letter, in fact, appears to be 'a', which is said to be 'a-don or mšam-med' "without (sexual) characteristics".

<sup>2</sup> So far as I have been able to discover, it is a mistake to regard the terms *drag-pa*, *žan-pa*, *ran-pa*, and *mšam-pa* as referring to "tones" (v. Francke, *Kleine Beitr.*, etc., ZDMG., Bd. 57 (1903), p. 294). They are rather alternative designations for letters of the *p'o*, *mo*, *ma nin* and *šin-tu mo* classes, like them referring to the strong (*fortis, tenuis*), weak (*lenis, media*), aspirated (*tenuis aspirata*), and nasal force or quality of the sound. On the other hand "tone", i.e. pitch, is designated as *skad* "voice", as Francke's test with the harmonium conclusively showed, a high note being designated by the native listener as *mo skad* ("woman's voice"), a low note as *p'o skad* ("man's voice"). These are the only two "tones" recognized, and *mo* and *p'o* are quite different here from *mo* and *p'o* as the designations of individual letters, as there they describe respectively the "soft" and "harsh" quality or intensity of the sound as "feminine" and "masculine". It thus arises, in fact, that they stand in exactly reverse senses, since a *mo* "feminine" (or *žan-pa* "weak") initial is in the *p'o skad* "man's voice" (low tone), a *p'o* "masculine" (or *drag-pa* "strong") initial in the *mo skad* or "woman's voice" (high tone), a point which Francke (*loc. cit.*) thought "etwas merkwürdig". He seems, in fact, like Georgi (*Alphabetum*

Then again, when prefixed, a new classification is given, and *g-* and *d-* are said to be *ma niñ*, *b-* to be *po*, *a-* to be *mo*, *m-* to be *šin-tu mo*, where the purely relative meanings attached to *ma niñ* and *po* are evidently the reason for their application to sounds otherwise classed as *mo*.

With these terms as their vehicles, the native grammarians then state the known rules governing the use of the prefixes which need hardly be repeated here.<sup>1</sup>

## B

§ 10. In any investigation of the Tibetan verb one must have clearly in mind at the outset its peculiarly simple nature. It cannot be separated from the substantive or adjective by the sharp dividing lines of Latin or Greek grammar, nor can its behaviour when functioning in verbal capacity be in any way likened to Indo-European usage.

It is, at best, simply a verbal noun, the mere name, in fact, of a state or action, barely distinguishable at times from the adjective or noun.

It is for this reason that when functioning in a sentence as a finite verb all notions of subjective relation, position, or movement with regard to the object, and any necessary conception of time, were indicated in the archaic language, as will be shown hereafter, by means of attached particles (prefixes, infixes, and suffixes), and were quite external to the root itself.

To accomplish this end the language was originally provided with a very complete mechanism, which, taking for the moment only the elements standing before the verb, still exhibits itself clearly in the two following forms :—

(a) Subjective only : *m-*, *a-*, or *b-*.

(b) Subjective + Objective : *b-r-*, *b-l-*, *b-s-*, and, perhaps, *b-d-*, *b-g-*.

It must not be understood from this that it is still so functioning. It is not. Nor has it done so during historic times. Yet the system has left sufficient impress upon the *Tibetanum*, 577–8), so many years ago to have been a little mixed in the matter, and to have attempted to see in what are Tibetan *termini technici* of phonetics the idea of tones as known to us (cf. Conrady, *CB.*, 92 n.). A careful study of the text of the commentary on T'on-mi sam-bho-ta's *rTags ajug-pa* (*Si-tui sum-rtags*) shows conclusively that no such idea was in the minds of the native grammarians.

<sup>1</sup> See *inter alia*, Schiefner, *TS.*, cols. 214–17, and the standard Tibetan Grammars of Csoma de Koros, Schmidt, Foucaux, Jäschke, Sarat Chandra Das, etc.

character of the remaining word forms, as regards their meaning, for very little doubt to remain as to the original sense of the prefixes.

Gradually, some time before the language was reduced to writing, the system fell into decay. The necessity for repeating before the verb a subject and the directive connection between the verb and its object was no longer felt, as these had already been stated sufficiently clearly in the preceding part of the sentence. Conservatism of word form, however (persistent to this day), caused the prefixes to remain, and coincidentally with the cessation of their original function they stepped into other fields, and the verb, from being originally one unified block, split and became correlated in two, three, or four forms (sometimes incorrectly called its "roots"), very largely with tense (the so-called "Present, Perfect, Future, and Imperative").

That this should have occurred is not in the least surprising, for ideas of time in the verb seem to have been almost entirely lacking, except for perhaps a suffix for the Past, which will probably turn out in the end to have been a locative element.<sup>1</sup> There was work, then, still for the prefixes to do, and they did it.

It is of no moment, consequently, when attempting to illumine the *origin* and *original* signification of the elements before the verb, to adduce e.g. "Perfects" in *b-*, "Futures" in *d-*, and so on, and it is beside the point to argue, as it can be argued with perfect truth, that the language, so long as we have known it, constructs its sentences in complete violation of the original principles here advanced.

To object, for instance, that *snam-pa* to smell, has no subjective *b-* in the so-called "Present", or that *šes-pa* without any prefixes at all parallels *mkjen-pa* to know, with subjective *m-* is proof of nothing except that the system is in decay. *snam-pa* and *šes-pa* are both forms probably quite unknown in the ancient language. The so-called "Perfect" of *snam-pa* i.e. *bsnams* brings us back to an original form (except for a probable former vocalization of the adhering elements), and *bšes-pa* which parallels the more abraded *šes-pa* still persists in the language, and clearly shows what has happened to it.

With what follows, consequently, it should always be borne in mind that it is not the abraded forms which have come down

<sup>1</sup> See § 49, *inf.*







In each of these eight cases the verbs fall naturally under two sub-heads. The first includes roots ending in *g*, *n*, [*d*],<sup>1</sup> *b*, *m*, and vowels, or, in other words, all verbs taking suffixed *-s* in the perfect, while the second comprises those ending in *d*, *n*, *r*, and *l*, or all verbs to the perfect roots of which *-d* was formerly suffixed.

Each of these two sub-groups may be conveniently subdivided again, according to the initial letter of the present root, into: (1) verb roots before which *b-*, in *br-*, *bl-*, *bs-*, etc., or *b-* alone is either actually present in the perfect and future roots, or is a phonetic possibility, and (2) verb roots, before the initials of which such a *b-* or *b*-containing prefix is phonetically impossible.

### § 13. *m-* :—

		Present.	Perfect.	Future.	Imperative.
Final <i>g</i> , <i>n</i> , [ <i>d</i> ], <i>b</i> , <i>m</i> , vowels.	Before all possible initials.	<i>m</i> . . . .	<i>m</i> . . . . <i>s</i>	<i>m</i> . . . .	<i>m</i> . . . . <i>s</i>
Final <i>d</i> , <i>n</i> , <i>r</i> , <i>l</i> .	Before all possible initials.	<i>m</i> . . . .			<i>m</i> . . . .

### § 14. *b-* :—

		Present.	Perfect.	Future.	Imperative.
Final <i>g</i> , <i>n</i> , [ <i>d</i> ], <i>b</i> , <i>m</i> , vowels.	Before all possible initials.	<i>b</i> . . . .	<i>b</i> . . . . <i>s</i>		<i>b</i> . . . . <i>s</i>
		<i>b</i> . . . .	<i>b</i> . . . . <i>s</i>		
		<i>b</i> . . . .			<i>b</i> . . . .
		<i>b</i> . . . . [ <i>d</i> ]	<i>b</i> . . . 0 <i>s</i>	<i>b</i> . . . . 0	<i>b</i> . . . . 0 <i>s</i>
		<i>b</i> . . . . [ <i>d</i> ]	<i>b</i> . . . 0 <i>s</i>	<i>b</i> . . . . 0	. . . 0 <i>s</i>
Final <i>d</i> , <i>n</i> , <i>r</i> , <i>l</i> .	Before all possible initials.	<i>b</i> . . . . [ <i>d</i> ]	<i>b</i> . . . 0 <i>s</i>	<i>b</i> . . . . 0	

<sup>1</sup> Verb roots ending in *-d* normally fall in the second class, but a large number of them lose the *-d* in all but the present root, and by virtue of the fact that they then, by compensation, take *-s* in the perfect and imperative, come to be actual members of the first group. This is here indicated by placing the final *-d* in square brackets: [*d*]. Such a verb is *gbud-pa*, P. *bus*, *pu(s)*, Fut. *dbu*, Imp. *pu(s)* to blow. Initial or final letters lost from the root are indicated in the tables by the zero sign: 0. Prefixed or suffixed letters which are often omitted, and thus tend to disappear, are placed in brackets, as e.g. (*b*)*r-*, (*-s*).

§ 15. *a-* :—

		Present.	Perfect.	Future.	Imperative.
<i>Final g, ṅ, [d], b, m, vowels.</i>	<i>b-</i> possible.	(1) $\begin{cases} a \dots \\ a \dots \\ q \dots [d] \end{cases}$	$\begin{matrix} b \dots s \\ b \dots s \\ b \dots s \end{matrix}$	$\begin{matrix} b \dots \\ b \dots \\ b \dots \end{matrix}$	$\begin{matrix} \dots s \\ b \dots \\ \dots \end{matrix}$
		(2) $\begin{cases} a \dots (s) \\ q \dots \end{cases}$	$\begin{matrix} b \dots \\ b \dots \end{matrix}$	$\begin{matrix} d \dots \\ d \dots \end{matrix}$	$\begin{matrix} \dots (s) \\ \dots (s) \end{matrix}$
		(3) $\begin{cases} a \dots \\ a \dots \\ a \dots \\ a \dots \end{cases}$	$\begin{matrix} b \dots \\ b \dots \\ b \dots \\ a \dots s \end{matrix}$	$\begin{matrix} g \dots (s) \\ g \dots \\ g \dots \\ g \dots \end{matrix}$	$\begin{matrix} \dots (s) \\ h \dots \\ (b) \dots \end{matrix}$
	<i>b-</i> impossible.	(2) $\begin{cases} a \dots \\ a \dots [d] \\ a \dots s \end{cases}$	$\begin{matrix} \dots s \\ \dots s \end{matrix}$	$\begin{matrix} d \dots \\ d \dots 0 \\ d \dots \end{matrix}$	$\begin{matrix} \dots s \\ \dots s \end{matrix}$
<i>Final d, n r, l.</i>	<i>b-</i> possible.	(1) $a \dots$	$b \dots$		
		(2) $a \dots$	$b \dots$	$d \dots$	
		(3) $\begin{cases} a \dots \\ a \dots \end{cases}$	$\begin{matrix} b \dots \\ b \dots \end{matrix}$	$\begin{matrix} g \dots \\ g \dots \end{matrix}$	$a \dots$
	<i>b-</i> impossible.	(2) $a \dots$	$d \dots$	$d \dots$	

§ 16. *d-* :—

		Present.	Perfect.	Future.	Imperative.
<i>Final g, n, [d], b, m, vowels.</i>	Before all possible initials.	$\begin{matrix} d \dots \\ d \dots \end{matrix}$	$\begin{matrix} d \dots s \\ d \dots s \end{matrix}$	$d \dots$	
<i>Final d, n, r, l.</i>	Before all possible initials.	$d \dots$	$d \dots$	$d \dots$	

§ 17. *g-* :—

		Present.	Perfect.	Future.	Imperative.
<i>Final g, ṅ, [d], b, m, vowels.</i>	<i>b-</i> possible.	$g \dots$	$b \dots$	$g \dots$	$\dots s$
		$g \dots$	$b \dots$		
		$g \dots$	$b \dots s$		
		$g \dots [d]$	$g \dots 0s$	$g \dots 0$	$g \dots 0s$
		$g \dots$	$g \dots s$		$g \dots s$
	<i>b-</i> impossible.	$g \dots$	$g \dots s$		$g \dots s$
		$g \dots$	$g \dots (s)$		$g \dots$
		$g \dots$	$g \dots s$		
<i>Final d, n, r, l.</i>	<i>b-</i> possible.	$g \dots$	$b \dots$	$g \dots$	$b \dots$
		$g \dots$	$b \dots$	$g \dots$	
		$g \dots$	$b \dots$	$g \dots$	$g \dots$
		$g \dots$	$b \dots$	$b \dots$	
	<i>b-</i> impossible.				

§ 18. *r*:-

		Present.	Perfect.	Future.	Imperative.
Final <i>g, ŋ, [d], b, m, vowels.</i>	<i>br</i> - possible.	<i>r</i> ....	<i>br</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>br</i> ....	<i>br</i> .... <i>s</i>
		<i>r</i> ....	<i>br</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>br</i> ....	( <i>b</i> ) <i>r</i> .... <i>s</i>
		<i>r</i> ....	<i>br</i> ....	<i>br</i> ....	<i>r</i> ....
		<i>r</i> ....[ <i>d</i> ]	<i>br</i> ....0 <i>s</i>	<i>br</i> ....0	<i>r</i> ....[ <i>d</i> ]
		<i>r</i> ....	<i>br</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>br</i> ....	
		<i>r</i> ....	<i>br</i> ....	<i>br</i> ....	
		<i>r</i> ....	<i>r</i> .... <i>s</i>		<i>r</i> ....( <i>s</i> )
		<i>r</i> ....	<i>r</i> .... <i>s</i>		
	<i>br</i> - impossible.	<i>r</i> ....	<i>r</i> ....0 <i>s</i>		<i>r</i> .... <i>s</i>
		<i>r</i> ....[ <i>d</i> ]	<i>r</i> .... <i>s</i>		
		<i>r</i> ....	<i>r</i> .... <i>s</i>		
Final <i>d, n, r, l.</i>	<i>br</i> - possible.	<i>r</i> ....	<i>br</i> ....	<i>br</i> ....	<i>r</i> ....
		<i>r</i> ....	<i>br</i> ....	<i>br</i> ....	
		<i>r</i> ....	<i>br</i> ....	<i>br</i> ....	
	<i>br</i> - impossible.	<i>r</i> ....			<i>r</i> ....

 § 19. *l*:-

		Present.	Perfect.	Future.	Imperative.
Final <i>g, n, [d], b, m, vowels.</i>	<i>bl</i> - possible.	<i>l</i> ....	<i>bl</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>bl</i> ....	<i>l</i> .... <i>s</i>
		<i>l</i> ....	<i>bl</i> ....	<i>bl</i> ....	<i>bl</i> ....
		<i>l</i> ....( <i>s</i> )	<i>l</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>bl</i> 0....	<i>bl</i> 0....( <i>s</i> )
		<i>l</i> ....	<i>l</i> 0....		<i>l</i> 0....
	<i>bl</i> - impossible.				
Final <i>d, n, r, l.</i>	<i>bl</i> - possible.	<i>l</i> ....	<i>bl</i> ....	<i>bl</i> ....	<i>bl</i> ....
		<i>l</i> ....	<i>bl</i> ....	<i>bl</i> ....	<i>l</i> ....
	<i>bl</i> - impossible.				

 § 20. *s*:-

		Present.	Perfect.	Future.	Imperative.
Final <i>g, ŋ, [d], b, m, vowels.</i>	<i>bs</i> - possible.	<i>s</i> ....	<i>bs</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>bs</i> ....	<i>s</i> .... <i>s</i>
		<i>s</i> ....	<i>bs</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>bs</i> ....	<i>s</i> ....
		<i>s</i> ....	<i>bs</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>bs</i> ....	
		<i>s</i> ....	<i>bs</i> .... <i>s</i>		
		<i>s</i> ....	<i>s</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>s</i> .... <i>s</i>	
		<i>s</i> ....	<i>s</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>s</i> ....	
		<i>s</i> ....	<i>s</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>s</i> ....	
		<i>s</i> ....[ <i>d</i> ]	<i>bs</i> ....0 <i>s</i>	<i>bs</i> ....0	<i>s</i> ....0 <i>s</i>
	<i>bs</i> - impossible.	<i>s</i> ....	<i>s</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>s</i> ....	<i>s</i> .... <i>s</i>
		<i>s</i> ....	<i>s</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>s</i> ....	<i>s</i> ....
		<i>s</i> ....	<i>s</i> .... <i>s</i>	<i>s</i> ....	
		<i>s</i> ....[ <i>d</i> ]	<i>s</i> ....0 <i>s</i>	<i>s</i> ....0	<i>s</i> ....()s
Final <i>d, n, r, l.</i>	<i>bs</i> - possible.	<i>s</i> ....	<i>bs</i> ....	<i>bs</i> ....	<i>bs</i> ....
		<i>s</i> ....	<i>bs</i> ....	<i>bs</i> ....	<i>s</i> ....
		<i>s</i> ....	<i>bs</i> ....	<i>bs</i> ....	
	<i>bs</i> - impossible.	<i>s</i> ....	<i>s</i> ....	<i>s</i> ....	

§ 21. Before passing on to a detailed consideration of the elements contained in these tables, it may be noted that each represents a later division into four parts, of an ancient single form.

That the four "roots" have basically nothing to do with time is in agreement with all the younger languages, such as those of Assam and Burma, where, again, the verb appears in similar expanded forms with subject prefix + directive infix, and regularly suffixes the time index.<sup>1</sup>

The *a*-verbs form a kind of "transition" system, being a mixture of three distinct classes: (1) Those having *b*- in the perfect and future (and rarely imperative); (2) those having *b*- in the perfect, and *d*- in the future; and (3) those having *b*- in the perfect, and *g*- in the future, with (very rarely) *b*- in the imperative. Except in the phonetically transformed present, the first coincide with the *b*-system, the second with *d*-system, while the third class belong under the *g*-verbs.

Support is also lent this original unity of the four roots by their vocalization, which exhibits in general the following sequences:—

<i>Present</i>	<i>Perfect</i>	<i>Future</i>	<i>Imperative</i>
<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>o</i>
	(more rarely <i>e</i> )	(more rarely <i>e</i> )	
<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>o</i>
	(very rarely <i>o, u</i> )	(very rarely <i>o, u</i> )	
<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>

Although but little can be said under this head at present it is possible that the original vocalization was, at least in some instances, a compound of the separate sounds of the various roots, consisting of a semi-vowel *i* or *u* and a vowel.

<sup>1</sup> The sole exception is offered by the Old Kuki group, where a prefix *la-*, *lai-*, *laik-*, *lêk-*, occurs, with the verb with present, imperfect, and past senses. (See LSI, iii, 3, *sub.* Hallâm, Aimol, Kolhreng, Kôm, and Hmâr). This is certainly derived from a Tai source, probably from Shân *lai* prefixed for past or perfect time. The writer finds himself at variance with the opinion expressed by Laufer (*Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft der Tibeter*, Sitzungsber d. kgl. bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu München, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 1898, Bd. i, pp. 529 and 543, quoted also by him in T'oung Pao, xv (1914), p. 99) that prefixed time indices occur in Tibetan, nor, so far as he is aware, can any support for that view be drawn from any of the later Tibeto-Burman languages, where time concepts, in consonance with the old historical principle of the group are regularly placed after the verb root.

On this point Chinese cognates sometimes throw interesting light.

Thus the vowel sequence in *ačad-pa*, P. and F. *bšad*, Imp. *šod* to speak, and in *šod-pa*, also *gšad-pa*, P. *bšad* id. may originate from a ground form (*b-*)*šyad*, approximating Chinese 說 \**šji<sup>w</sup>ät* (< -d) (*swiet*), and the two parallel forms *gšod-pa* and *gšad-pa* to comb, seem to point to an original parent (*g-*)*šyad*, agreeing with Chinese 刷 \**š<sup>w</sup>at* (< s-) (*šwat*).

§ 22. Against the view that in this material we have the now sundered fragments of once single units, the statements of the native grammarians can hardly be urged.

It is perfectly true, and has been so ever since T'on-mi sam-bho-ṭa's time, to say<sup>1</sup> that *b-* is used in the past (*adas*), *g-* and *d-* for the present (*da ltar*), though they are by no means specific indices for these tenses.

That the statement should be made is simply evidence of a fact with which we are already perfectly familiar, viz. that the split had already occurred in the verb root when the observer wrote, and that the fragments were already, at least in part, recognized to have become associated with differences in time.<sup>2</sup>

It is much more significant that the statement should be made that *a-* is used for *bdaḡ*<sup>3</sup> (lit. self), and *m-* for *mḥam* (lit. unchanging (state)), as this is in line with the writer's belief that the former (*a-*) indicates an acting subject (the "self"), and *m-* the subject of intransitive verbs, especially those describing invariable states.<sup>4</sup>

That *b-* is stated to show the active (*gžan bsgrub*, lit. to act upon (or coerce) another) is particularly interesting in view of its kinship with *a-* (v. § 29).

We could hardly have a clearer statement that *b-*, *a-* (both originally \**ba*, v. § 29) were still distinctly felt to have once been indices of the subject (*bdaḡ*) of active and active transitive verbs.

The whole question of the native grammarians' theories as to the prefixes of his own language has recently been

<sup>1</sup> See Laufer, *Sprachw.*, pp. 542-3, and compare T'P., xv (1914), p. 99.

<sup>2</sup> r. § 10, *sup.*

<sup>3</sup> It is significant that this term is also used to designate the suffix *-pa* of the acting agent, which is called *bdaḡ-poi sgra* or *bdaḡ sgra*, i.e. the syllable of the actor or agent (lit. lord or master), as we may have here unwitting recognition of the fact that there is a probable basic relationship between this element *-pa* (and the so-called "infinitive" suffix *-ba*) and the prefixed *b-*, *a-* (< \**ba-*, v. § 29).

<sup>4</sup> See § 26 *inf.*, and Journ. Ling. Soc. Am., vol. iv (1928), pp. 277-80.

exhaustively treated by Bacot,<sup>1</sup> through whose work we are brought to a final understanding of the theories they held.

Though amusingly ingenious and displaying considerable thought on the part of their writers, all their interpretations suffer from the same fault: that we are not able on their basis to correlate any one element with any single and distinctive sense such as it must in the first place have carried.

For it would be impossible, as an instance, for *b-*, if a temporal element for past time (*adas*), to jump over without warning into an active or objective sense, or again, if *a-* indicates the active (subject), it could never have appeared elsewhere as a future (*ma <ons*) index.

Their theories, in fact, are based upon the material offered by the written forms of the language only *after* the verb, by splitting, had settled out into two, three, or four forms largely correlated with time (v. § 10).

Nor are they immune in their theorizing from certain alien influences.

That they should ascribe "middle voice"<sup>2</sup> to *a-* verbs is a point at which Sanskrit influence stands out strongly, as it does again when the active *b-* type is chosen for treatment.

These two are made in this way to stand opposite each other as the *ātmane padam* and *parasmāi padam* of Sanskrit.<sup>3</sup>

It is quite evident that desire for parallelism with the language of greater culture has overbalanced reason at this point, for in neither instance does the selected type cover the case. There are too many *a-* verbs of active and transitive nature, and too many "middle" and neuter *b-* verbs<sup>4</sup> to allow of our considering the native grammarian's statements as covering the issue here.

Taken as a whole, the material in the tables may be divided into two parts, (a) elements standing before the verb root; (b) those after it.

#### (a) *Elements standing before the Verb Root*

These may be subdivided into: (1) Pronominal or Subjective; (2) Directive or Objective.

<sup>1</sup> *Les Ślokas Grammaticaux de Thonmi sambhota*, Paris, 1928.

<sup>2</sup> v. Bacot, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>3</sup> v. Laufer, *Sprachw.*, 543.

<sup>4</sup> The type is: *bžugs-pa* to live or be resident at. *slob-dpon tson-k'u-na bžugs* the teacher lives at Tsonk'a. This states a mere condition and is equivalent to the neuter verb in *a-* in *na agro-gi yod* I go (lit. My going is), and the subject appears psychologically in the genitive.



1. *The Pronominal or Subjective Prefixes*

§ 23. These always stand first, and cannot have any other element placed before them. They are represented by *m-* and *b-*, the latter only of which is used when there is an object infix present. In other words, *m-* is inseparable from the root, *b-* separable, but both are independent in that both can occur alone before verb roots without any objective element.

§ 24. These elements *m-* and *b-* are probably basically related to the suffixes *-ma* and *-ba*,<sup>1</sup> and it is not surprising, then, that we find a distinction between *-ma* and *-ba* which makes *-ma* a substantival suffix while *-ba* is the verbal ("infinitive") element, since, as we shall see in the sequel, this is just the distinction existing between the prefixes *m-* and *b-*, for while *m-* occurs with inactive verbs (without directive infix), *b-* is used with those of active transitive nature (with directive infix), *m-* thus standing before verbs of "substantival" nature, as against *b-* with those of truer predicative value.

This distinction is likewise in evidence where no directive infix occurs with the *b-* member.

Accordingly, as an instance, from the same root as *čē-ba*, *čēn-po* great, we have the inactive intransitive *m-* verb, *mčēd-pa* to spread, to gain ground (as a fire), to become greater, but from *čū*<sup>2</sup> water, a *b-* form of active transitive force in *ačū-ba*, P. *bčus*, F. *bču*, Imp. *čus* to ladle or scoop up water, to water, to irrigate.

In view of this possible kinship with the suffixes, the form *ma-* in *ma-kyen* (for usual *mkyen*) to know, reported by Francke<sup>3</sup> in a document probably of the ninth century from Turfan, is of interest.

<sup>1</sup> The original pronominal nature of these two suffixes which was suggested many years ago by Schiefner (*T.S.*, cols. 341 *et seqq.*), was probably very indefinite and something like "the one who (or which)" or even more indefinite "one" with a reflexive subjective sense which is often very clear. So in e.g. from *la* a being high, we have through the perfect verb form *zla* (probably from *bla*. See *Zer-Myig* (ed. Francke in Asia Major), fol. 8b, l. 6; 10b, l. 3; 25b, l. 6; 45a, l. 5) (being) elevated, (being) raised on high, the derivative *zla-ba* being elevated—the one, i.e. the moon, and again, from the same root *la* a being exalted or elevated, through the verb form *bla* (lit. his being exalted) the derivative *bla-ma* his being exalted—the one, an exalted one, i.e. a lama. We probably have in these indefinite reflexive particles part of an archaic suffixed pronominal scheme. For supporting evidence for a former vocalization of *m-* and *b-* as *\*ma-* and *\*ba-*, see § 29 *inf.*

<sup>2</sup> An inactive intransitive form in *m-* (*n-*) of this root seems to occur in Lhôtā as *n-či* to become wet (deducible from *n-či-á* perf. "wet"), related to *o-ču* water. For the *i : u* vowel relationship see § 127.

<sup>3</sup> *Tibetische Handschriftenfunde aus Turfan*, Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch., Philosoph.-histor. Kl. vom 31 Januar, 1924, p. 11.

§ 25. Both these elements (*m-* and *b-*) appear to have been demonstrative rather than personal, as they covered all three persons. They were probably demonstratives of impersonal form, reflexive demonstratives in fact, signifying "the one, that one, that same (*idem*)", with reference to the subject already mentioned.

*m-*

§ 26. The description of *m-* by the native grammarians as *mñam*<sup>1</sup> "the same, unchanging", probably carries a deeper meaning than that attributed to it by Laufer, that *m-* verbs are not capable of assuming other formative elements, but always retain their *m-* form. It seems also to have been the intention to convey here the statement that *m-* verbs are those of intransitive nature, or which at most describe an act on the part of the subject which does not entail any change in position on the part of such subject, or an indirect object when present.

Of this nature are actually many verbs in *m-*, as, for instance: *mfoñ-ba* to behold, *mñes-pa* to be glad, *mña-ba* to be, to have, *mnam-pa* to smell (to be odorous, intr.), and others.

It is not then surprising to find these verbally weak *m-* forms passing into pure substantives<sup>2</sup> or adjectives. Examples of this are:—

(1) *mdun* the fore-part, the front side, that portion with which one first meets, *mdun-ma* wife (*conjunct*), she with whom one is united, *mdud-pa* a knot, a bow, as against the still actively verbal forms with other prefixes: *sdud-pa* (P. *bsdus*, F. *bsdu*, Imp. *sdus*, *bsdu*) vb. tr. to unite, to join, to put together, *adu-ba* (P. *adus*) vb. intr. to assemble, to come together.<sup>3</sup>

(2) *mfo-ba* to be high, to be elevated, whence also adj. high, elevated (= *mfoñ-po*); subst. height, elevation, as against *adon-pa* (P. *btön*, F. *gdon*, Imp. *ton*) vb. tr. to elevate, to raise; *afoñ-pa* (P. and Imp. *ton*) vb. intr. to rise, to arise.

<sup>1</sup> v. *Zam.*, l. 80. r. Laufer, *Sprachw.*, p. 542, and *ST.* 56, where the significance of *m-* is explained as: *ñar bñad-pai bdag gzan dan dus gsum-gyi bye-brag-med-par tams-ñad-la mñam-pa-ste mtsuñs-pa-ñid bsgrub-pai pyir ajug-go*.

<sup>2</sup> The writer has already treated this point in connection with certain selected substantives in another place. See *Language, Journ. Ling. Soc. Amer.*, vol. iv (1928), pp. 277 *et. seqq.*

<sup>3</sup> For still other cognates, see § 55, below (pp. 61–2).

(3) *mdun* lance, spear, pike ; sting (of insects), as against *bdun-ba* and *rdun-ba* (P. *brduñs*, F. *brduñ*, Imp. (*b*)*rduñs*) to beat, to strike, to cudgel.

(4) *mko-ba* desirable, to be wished for, as against *ako-ba* to wish, to want, and possibly *dyos-pa* to be necessary, to be obliged or compelled, to need, to want.

(5) *mgyogs-pa* quick, speedy, swift, as against *rgyug-pa* (P. *brgyugs*, F. *brgyug*) to make haste, to hurry, to rush, *akyug-pa* (P. *kyug*) to run, to dart or shoot along rapidly (as light, pain, etc.).

(6) *mkrig-ma* wrist (i.e. joint), as against *akrig-pa* to cohere, to stick together, *agrig-pa* to be or belong together, *sgrig-pa* (P. *bsgrigs*, F. *bsgrig*, Imp. *sgrig(s)*) to put, lay, or fit together, to join ("as the separate parts of an animal body" (Jk.)).

(7) *mjed-pa* suffering, enduring, bearing patiently, as against *bžad-pa*, more commonly *bzod-pa* to suffer, to endure, to bear.

(8) *mkegs-pa* adj. hard, firm, solid, compact, as against *agrag-pa*, *agrog-pa*, also *sgrog-pa*, P. *bsgrags*, F. *bsgrag*, Imp. *sgrag(s)* to bind, to fasten, to tie together.

(9) *mfoñs* an opening for the smoke in a ceiling or roof, *mfoñs-ka* open gallery, opening in the middle of a square building, as against *stoñs-pa* (P. *bstañs*, F. *bstañ* (?) ) vb. intr. to be empty or vacant, vb. caus. to make empty or vacant.

(10) *mñal* womb (as the "resting-place" of the "inert, torpid" foetus), as against *bsñal-ba* to be faint, to be exhausted. Also (without prefix): *ñal-ba* to be fatigued, tired, or wearied; fatigue, weariness; probably also: listless, torpid, still, meanings verging towards the possible basic sense of *mñal*.

(11) *mgal* jaw, jawbone (lit. "(the parts) in opposition"), as against *agal-ba* to be in opposition, to be contradictory, *rgol-ba*, P. and F. *brgol* to dispute, to combat, to fight, *rkal-ba* (?), P. *brkal* to quarrel, to accuse. Also (without prefix): *gal-ba* to force or press something upon a person, *gal* constraint, compulsion.<sup>1</sup>

(12) *mkom-pa* (Schr.) convenience, opportunity, ease, leisure to do anything, as against *sgom-pa*, P. *bsgoms*, F. *bsgom*, Imp. *sgom(s)* to fancy, to imagine; to meditate, to contemplate, to consider (w. acc. and dat.); to entertain, to

<sup>1</sup> Probably belonging here (more specifically with *agal-ba*) is: *gal-te* if, in case, perhaps more literally "standing opposed" (i.e. on (the) one hand, as one of two opposite possibilities).

produce in one's mind. Also (without prefix): *kom-pa* to be able (to do anything).

(13) *mkon-pa* (Schr.) discordant, disagreeing, not uniform, not in unison, as against *akon-pa* (P. (acc. Lexx.) *bkon*) to feel annoyance or dissatisfaction with (cc. *dañ*). Also (without prefix): *kon-po* anger, grudge, resentment.

(14) *mdab-ma* (Schr.) leaf (= *adab-ma* leaf, petal; wing; flat board; fan, flag; to which are related *adabs*, *adab* side, surface, *deb-ma* poultice, cataplasm, application), as against *ltab-pa*, P. *bltabs*, F. *bltab*, Imp. *ltob* to fold, lay or put together, *lteb-pa* to double down, to turn in, *ldeb-pa* to bend round or back, to turn back (fold), to double down.

(15) *mgron-pa* (Schr.) strange, foreign, as against *bgrod-pa* to go, to walk, to wander, *agrod-pa*, *sgrod-pa* (rare) to go, to travel, *skrod-pa*, P. and F. *bskrad* to expel, to drive out, to eject. Also with the final *-n* (v. § 55 *inf.*); *agron* alienism, the state of being a foreigner, *kron-pa* well, spring (as a point of "coming forth").<sup>1</sup>

(16) *mñen-pa* flexible, pliable, supple, soft, smooth, as against *bsñen-pa* to propitiate, to soothe (lit. to bend the feelings).

(17) *mfsan*<sup>2</sup> grandchild, nephew, as against *btša-ba*, P. *btšas* to bear, to bring forth, to give birth to. Also (without prefix): *tša-bo* grandchild, grandson, *tša-mo* granddaughter, niece.

(18) *mkar* castle, citadel, fort, stronghold, as against *dgar-ba* to confine, to pen up, to shut up in an enclosure, *akar-ba* (WT. intr. to foregoing) to be penned up, to be confined, *skar-ba* (Cs.) to pen up cattle.

(19) *mdzug-gu* (also *mdzub-mo*) finger, toe, claw (perh. lit. the small piece set on),<sup>3</sup> and possibly *mjug* hind part; posteriors, back-side; tail; end, as against *adzugs-pa*, *zug-pa*, P. *bitsugs*, *zugs*, F. *gzugs*, Imp. *zug(s)* to erect (a pillar), to

<sup>1</sup> Compare Laufer, *Klu ŋum bsduš pai sñin po*, pp. 64–6, where the word carries more distinctly the same sense as *bgrod-pa* though as a substantive "holzerner Wasserkanal", and not so much the idea of "source".

<sup>2</sup> Occurs in an early document from Chinese Turkestan (vol. lvi, fol. 72, l. 46), published by Thomas, JRAS., 1927, p. 74, where *ku-mfsan* appears for the later *ku-tšan* uncle(s) and nephew(s).

<sup>3</sup> The basic sense of this group may be rather one of "insertion" (setting in), and *mdzug-gu* consequently "a piece set in, added in a socket". This, in view of many of the significations of *adzugs-pa*, such as "to prick or stick into, to pierce, to thrust in, to sting," of *ajug-pa*, P. *bčug*, F. *gčug*, Imp. *čug* to insert, to infuse, to inject, of *atsugs-pa*, P. *tšugs* to go into, to penetrate, to take root in, and their variants in final *-d*.

raise (a standard) ; to set out plants (in the ground), *aʃug-pa* to be combined with, to have added to (as prefixed or suffixed letters).

(20) *mkrāṇ(-ba)* (also *kraṇ*) hard, solid, compact, as against *agraṇ-ba* to satisfy, to satiate, to stuff (with food), *skraṇ-ba*, P. *skraṇs* to swell, to become distended or hard with swelling.

(21) *mgul* neck, throat (lit. that which bends, inclines, or turns), as against *agul-ba* to change position or posture, to move, *sgul-ba*, P. and F. *bsgul* to move, to put in motion.

(22) *mgur* neck, throat (lit. that which bends, inclines, or turns), as against *dgur-ba* to bend, to make crooked (e.g. *mgo dgur-ba* to duck or bend down the head, to stoop), *dgu-ba* to bend, to make crooked (as in *mgo dgu-ba* = *mgo dgur-ba*), *dgur*, *rgur*, *sgur*<sup>1</sup> adj. crooked.

(23) *mśams* border, boundary line, frontier (lit. that which meets flush, runs parallel to or is in accord with), as against *ačam-pa*, P. *bčam* to accord, to agree.

(24) *mdan-pa* cheek, side of the face (Lex., for more usual *ldan-pa*) (lit. that which is beside), as against *ldan-pa* to be beside, to be near to, *gda-ba* to be present, *lta-ba*, P. *bltas*, F. *blta*, Imp. *ltos*, *blta* to look, to view (prob. basically "to set the eyes beside") ("associative" -l-, v. § 39 *inf.*) ; cf. the very frequent *mig lta-ba*).<sup>2</sup> Also (without prefix) : *da* now, at present, *da-lta(r)* id.<sup>3</sup>

(25) *mñam-pa* alike, equal, the same ; even, level, flat, as against *sñom(s)-pa*, P. *bsñoms*, F. *bsñom* to make even or level.

Supporting the contention that these substantival and adjectival *m-* forms are transfers from the verbal domain, are the frequent cases in which an *m-* verb functions also as a substantive or an adjective, as instances of which we have *mñun-pa* to be in agreement, also agreement, harmony, *mfo-ba* to be high, also height, and adj. high. These from among a number of similar cases.

<sup>1</sup> It is possible that the -r here and in *dgur-ba*, and *mgur* itself, may be terminative in origin, and not belong to the root. See § 57 *inf.*

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps related is also *ston-pa*, P. and F. *bstan* to show (to be instrumental in setting another's eyes beside).

<sup>3</sup> In this group it is possible that there should also be included *brta-ba*, P. *brtas* to grow wide, to extend sideways, whence to grow fat, to increase (of passions, etc.), *brtan-ma*, *bslan-ma*, *bslan-pa-mo* the goddess of the earth (visualized as "the extended one" ?), with possibly *mā-ma* edge, margin ; border, frontier ; side, *tad(-ka)* direction ("side" ?), whence *tad-du* (w. gen.) over against, in the presence of, beside.

This passage of *m*- forms into substantives and adjectives finds, as we shall later see (§§ 68, 69), much fuller development in Kachin.

§ 27. Among the typical neuter (inactive intransitive) verbs in *m*- are :—

*mgu-ba* to rejoice, to be glad or content.  
*mčed-pa* to spread, to gain ground (as fire, plague, etc.) (related to *čē-ba* great, *čen(-po, -mo)* id., *čē-ba*, P. *čes* to be great).  
*mčun-pa* (also *ačun-pa*)<sup>1</sup> to be in agreement or harmony.  
*mnar-ba* to suffer, to be tormented.  
*mnod-pa, nod-pa*, P. and Imp. *mnos* to receive.  
*mnam-pa* to smell, to stink.  
*mna-ba* to be, to exist; to have.  
*mto-ba* to be high.  
*mton-ba* to behold, to perceive, to know, to understand.  
*mčis-pa* to be, to exist.  
*mčser-ba* (also *ačser-ba*)<sup>1</sup> to feel grief, sorrow, or anxiety.  
*mno-ba* to think, to fancy.  
*mnal-ba* to sleep.  
*mjal-ba*, Imp. *mjal* to meet, to come together.  
*mkjen-pa* to know, to understand.  
*mčod-pa* to honour, to revere, to respect.  
*mdza-ba* to be in agreement or accord, to love.

§ 28. A reflexive<sup>2</sup> force is naturally inherent in many *m*- verbs, as no direct external object is present. Thus :—

*mčon-ba, mčonš-pa* to jump, to throw or cast oneself.  
*mgu-ba* to rejoice or be glad (within oneself).  
*mčed-pa* to spread of itself, to gain ground spontaneously.

And so on with most of the verbs in the last section.

Other verbs of this nature not appearing in the preceding section are :—

*mči-ba* to appear, to show oneself (whence : to come or go).  
*mnab-pa* to put on (garments), to dress oneself.

<sup>1</sup> Interchange between *m*- and *a*- may be based on an original \**ma*- (\**ma*-) and the forms thus be splits of \**ma*-. The derivation of the *a*- member in such cases from an original \**ba*- form (v. § 29) would not then be necessary, and the interchange of both *m*- and *b*- forms with others in *q*- would be due to analogical splits as well as to practical identity of meaning.

<sup>2</sup> Here we have the origin of the reflexive subject force of Mikir *in*- (v. § 161 *inf.*).

*a-*

§ 29. It seems almost certain that *a-* represents another form of the same original prefix as *b-*, of which, indeed, *a-* in many positions acts simply as a phonetic variant. Thus, before aspirated initials *a-* occurs, while with the same root *b-* is used with the surds. So, for instance, in the type: *ačĩns-pa*, P. *bčĩns*, F. *bčĩn*, Imp. *ačĩn(s)* to bind.

It is probable, in fact, that we have here a split of an original *\*ba-* into *(b)a-* and *b(a)-*, and this for the following reasons:—

An examination of the prefix tables (§§ 17–20) shows that in compound, and once compound, prefixes, the second element remains generally with the present as against the first with the perfect (and future) of the dictionaries. Now this is exactly true of the two components of our supposedly original *\*ba-* (ᳵᳵ) <sup>1</sup> the second element (*a-*) remaining in the present, while the first (*b-*) effects the perfect (and future), as in e.g. *ačad-pa*, P. and F. *bšad* to explain, and many others (v. § 15).

A single prefix is thus split in the same manner as a double one when a vowel may be supposed to have once been present.<sup>2</sup>

The evidence of Kachin *a-* (§§ 77–8), Âo Nâgâ *â-* (§ 139), Lhôtâ Nâgâ *e-* (§ 150), i.e. the prefixes of Series 0 (v. § 104), is in direct line with this, and Jäschke's statement (*Dic.* xiv) that ᳵ is the "vowel absolute" is of new interest.

That *a-* frequently interchanges with *m-* as in e.g. *aʃud-pa*, *mʃud-pa* to lengthen, *aʃun-pa*, *mʃun-pa* to agree,<sup>3</sup> is nothing against this. We find the same interchange in the languages of Assam, particularly when compared with Tibetan (see §§ 120, 138, 149, 150, 160). It represents as we shall see in the sequel, one of two things: either a "cross change" (between *a-* (< *\*ba-*) and *m-*) arising from the practical identity in meaning of the two elements *b-*, *(b)a-*, and *m-*, or, the two fragments of an original *\*ma-* (i.e. *a-* and *m-*, v. § 27 n. 1.). It

<sup>1</sup> This is given here as a graphic device only, to show the original standing of the now separated elements to each other.

<sup>2</sup> This necessitates the assumption of a triple split in the type *aʃug-pa*, P. *bčug*, F. *gčug*, to put into, and is probably evidence in favour of a vocalization of *b-* differing from that of *d-*, *g-*, *r-*, *l-*, and *s-*. In view of the probable basic identity of *b-* and *m-* with *-ba* and *-ma* (§ 24) as against the possible connection of *d-*, (*g-*), *r-*, and *s-* with the so-called "terminative" suffixes in *u*, this is not surprising. It is possible, further, that many of the interchanges between *a-* and *m-* are on the same footing as those between *a-* and *b-* and are based upon an original *\*ma-* as much as upon closely allied functional rôles (see § 27).

<sup>3</sup> For other examples, see Conrady, *CB.*, 23.

certainly does not limit us to supposing only a  $a- = m-$  equation.<sup>1</sup>

Any clear separation, indeed, of  $a-$  and  $b-$  as to sense is well-nigh impossible. They overlap at every turn. Both can carry the *de nid* element within themselves (v. § 47), as in *nas lha-sa-la a<sup>Δ</sup>gro-gi yod* I am going to Lhasa, *slob-dpon tson-ka-na b<sup>Δ</sup>zugs* the teacher lives at Tsonk'a, *de a<sup>Δ</sup>kar-ba-la b<sup>Δ</sup>rten-no* He leant upon a staff, and they are in almost every way interchangeable : *gšam-du a<sup>Δ</sup>ad* or *gšam-du b<sup>Δ</sup>ad* It will be explained below, etc.

Equivalence of function would, of course, be a natural consequence of basic identity, and though originally standing against  $m-$  in representing an *acting* subject,  $a-$  and  $b-$  forms have often verged towards the  $m-$  domain (neuter subjects), since they all three have in common a subjective sense.

The position historically seems to have developed thus :—

(1) Anciently :	Prefix. Subject indicated.	<i>*bq-</i> Active transitive	<i>m- (*ma- ?)</i> Neuter (Inact. intr.)
(2) Later :	Prefix. Subject indicated.	$\overbrace{b- \quad \quad a-}$ Active transitive, also Act. intr. and Neuter.	<i>m- (and a- ?)</i> Neuter frequently > "lapsed" subst <sup>s</sup> . <sup>2</sup> , more rarely Act. intr.

Interchange between  $a-$  and  $m-$  may thus be founded either simply upon their possession in common of a subjective

<sup>1</sup> See Sten Konow, ZDMG., 56 (1902), p. 493, on the views expressed by Conrady (CB., 23).

That *kha-ada*, *abi-abi* should be written for Sanskrit *khandā*, *bimbī*, is nothing but proof that at the time when these words were introduced, Tibetan scribes recognized, and pandered to, the practice of assimilation, whereby the colourless, and by that time meaningless, prefix  $a-$  of the second element, was transferred back to, and became the final of, the first, agreeing in nature with the new following initial, just as in native words *bka agyur* becomes *kan-dyur*, *kan-gyur* or *bka abum* becomes *kam-bum*. It is no proof at all of relationship between  $a-$  and  $m-$ , as Conrady seems to have believed.

Laufer, more recently, on the other hand (*The Prefix a- in the Indo-Chinese Languages*, JRAS., 1915, p. 773, n.), who has noticed the interchange of Kachin *ma-* with  $a-$ , only mentions that the two elements are in general on the same footing, and equivalent, in Indo-Chinese. For the rest his remarks do not concern us directly here (see, however, §§ 103, 185-6).

<sup>2</sup> For a special treatment of some of these, see the writer's article in the Journ. Ling. Soc. Amer., iv (1928), pp. 277-80 ; also § 26 *sup.*



sense, or, as mentioned above, be traceable to an original *\*ma-*, in which event the type *aťser-ba*, *mťser-ba* to feel sorrow, to grieve, represent splits of *\*ma-ťser*.

It is probable that both causes have been at work, for while the types given above remain neuter and would thus in both members be descended from *\*ma-*, a number of instances occur in which an active usage (*a-* < *\*ba*) has apparently exerted its weight and attracted the *m-* form into its own sense (active), as in : *aťol-ba*, *mťol-ba* to make a confession, *aťud-pa*, *mťud-pa* to make longer, *aķyud-pa*, *mķyud-pa* to embrace, etc.

It is probable, then, that the active type *ačad-pa*, *bšad-pa* to explain, *agrañ-ba*, *bgrañ-ba* to count, *agrad-pa*, *bgrad-pa* to open wide, to extend (a species of word-pair which is very common) reduce down to original invariable forms *\*ba-šad*, *\*ba-grañ*, *\*ba-grad*, etc., and that the so-called " roots " of e.g. *aťo-ba*, P. *bžos*, F. *bžo*, Imp. *aťos* are splits of an older *\*ba-ťo*.

#### *b-*, *a-*

§ 30. That this prefix represents an acting subject clearly appears in some instances in which a verb of this nature in *b-*, *a-* will stand opposed to the plain root in substantival sense.

This occurs in the following :—

*ačũ-ba*, P. *bčus*, F. *bču*, Imp. *čus* to ladle or scoop up water, to irrigate, to water, as against *čũ* water.

*bžo-ba*, *bžos-pa*, *aťo-ba* to milk, as against *žo* milk.

*ačems-pa*, P. *bčem*, F. *bčem* to chew, as against *ťsems* tooth.

*aťsem-pa*, P. *ťsems*, *btsems*, F. *btsem*, Imp. *ťsems* to sew, as against *ťsem(-po)* seam, *ťsem-bu* what has been stitched, darned, or quilted.

*aķur-ba*, P. and F. *ķur*, rarely *bķur* to carry or convey (a load), as against *ķur* load, burden.

*bgom-pa*, P. *bgams* to walk, to step, to stride, as against *gom-pa* step, pace.

Conversely, when the perfect of a *b-*, *a-* verb lapses into a substantival or adjectival sense, the active prefix is very generally dropped. Examples of this occur in § 55, *q.v.*

That *b-*, *a-*, is an acting subject is again very clear where it appears alone with active transitive verbs otherwise taking a directive infix. Instances are :—

(1) *bduñ-ba* to beat, to strike, otherwise *rduñ-ba*, P. *brduñs*, F. *brduñ*, Imp. (*b*)*rduñs*.

(2) *bdar-ba* to polish, to grind, otherwise *rdar-ba*.

(3) *bdal-ba* to spread or lay out, otherwise *gdal-ba*, or *rdal-ba*, P. and F. *brdal*, Imp. *rdol*.

(4) *bgrañ-ba* (also *agrañ-ba*), P. *bgrañs* to count, to number, otherwise *sgrañ-ba*, P. *bsgrañs*, F. *bsgrañ*, Imp. *sgroñ*.

(5) *bgrod-pa* (also *agrod-pa*) to go, to travel, otherwise (though rarely) *sgrod-pa*.

(6) *bgro-ba*, P. *bgros* to discuss, to deliberate, to consider, otherwise *sgro-ba*, P. *bsgros*, F. *bsgro*, Imp. *sgro*.

(7) *agal-ba* to oppose, to combat, otherwise *rgol-ba*, P. and F. *brgol*.

(8) *ačad-pa*, P. and F. *bšad*, Imp. *šod* to tell, to relate, to explain, otherwise *rřod-pa*, P. and F. *brřod*.

(9) *bgad-pa* to laugh, otherwise *rgod-pa* or *dgod-pa*.

(10) *akrab-pa*, P. *bkrab* (?) to stamp, to tread heavily, otherwise *skrab-pa*.

(11) *aķel-ba*, P. *ķel* to put, load, or pack on, otherwise *agel-ba*, P. *bkal*, F. *dgal*, Imp. *kol*.

(12) *agrogs-pa*, *agrags-pa* to bind, to tie, to fasten on, otherwise *sgrog-pa*, P. *bsgrags*, F. *bsgrag*, Imp. *sgrag(s)*.

(13) *agrag(s)-pa*, P. *grags* to cry or shout out or at, *agrogs-pa* id., otherwise *sgrog-pa*, P. *bsgrags*, F. *bsgrag*, Imp. *sgrag(s)*.

(14) *ařum-pa*, P. *ařums*, *btums*, F. *btum*, Imp. *ařum*, *btum* to cover or lay over; to wrap up, to envelop; *btum-pa* id., otherwise *gřum-pa*.

(15) *btod-pa* to fasten, to tether, to tie up, otherwise *řtod-pa*, *gtod-pa* id.

(16) *btog-pa* to pluck, to gather, otherwise *gtog-pa* id.

(17) *bgrad-pa* (also *agrad-pa*) to spread, to extend, to open wide, otherwise (Lexx.) *bsgrad-pa*.

Likewise *b-* or *a-* is the one characteristic in some verbal series where an acting subject is concerned, as e.g. *ařur-ba* to rise up, to sprout or spring up; *ařur-ba*, P. *řur* to fly; *ařyur-ba* to mount, to rise up; *ařor-ba*, P. and Imp. *bor* to throw, cast, or fling up (into the air); *ařar-ba* to fly up (as sparks), to splash up (as water); *ařyar-ba*, Imp. *ařyor*, *řyor* to lift up, to raise up, to hoist.

§ 31. It is worthy of note that in the majority of cases, the typical active verb in *b-*, *a-* belongs in a group from which a member in *-s*-, causative or transitive in meaning, is absent.

This, doubtless, finds its explanation in the fact that the other members of its group are not themselves sufficiently strong to allow the *b-*, *a-* form to lapse back into an inactive

intransitive sense, as is so general where the group contains a strong (causative or transitive) *-s-* member (v. § 33).

The following groups, from which an *-s-* verb is absent, illustrate the usual surroundings of the typical active verb in *b-*, *a-* :—

- (1) *abad-pa*, Imp. *abod* to endeavour, to exert oneself, to apply oneself to (w. *-la* or term.).  
*rbad-pa*, Imp. *rbod* to set on, to incite; to excite, to instigate; to animate.  
*pod-pa* to be able (morally), to prevail on oneself (to do).
- (2) *ačad-pa*, P. and F. *bšad*, Imp. *šod* to explain, to tell, to relate.  
*gšad-pa* id. (also *bšad-pa*, prop. perf.).  
*rʃod-pa*, P. and F. *brʃod* to say, to pronounce, to utter, to propound, to promulgate or set forth.  
*šod-pa*, P. *bšad* to say, to declare.
- (3) *ačkyud-pa* to keep, to hold, to embrace, to hug.  
*mkyud-pa* (Cs.) id.  
*kyud-mo* rim (of a vessel).
- (4) *ačkyug-pa*, P. *kyug* to run; to dart or sweep along rapidly.  
*rgyug-pa*, P. *brgyugs*, F. *brgyug* to run, to hasten, to hurry, to rush.  
*rgyu-ba* to go, to walk, to move, to wander.
- (5) *agal-ba* to counteract, to transgress, to violate, to infringe (tr.) (also : to be in opposition to, to be contradictory to (intr.)).  
*rgol-ba*, P. and F. *brgol* to dispute, to combat, to fight.  
*gal-ba* to force or press something upon a person.  
*gal* subst. constraint, compulsion.  
*rkal-ba* (?), P. *brkal* to quarrel with, to accuse (w. *-la*) (Dzl.) (see also § 26 s.v. *mgal*).
- (6) *agud-pa*, P. *gud* to ruin, to reduce to an extremity.  
*rgud-pa* to decline, to sink, to become weak or frail.
- (7) *ačkrid-pa*, P. *krid*, F. *bkri* (?) to lead, to conduct; to command, to head. (Isolated root.)
- (8) *adrub-pa* to sew, to embroider; to heal. (Isolated root.)
- (9) *ačĩn-ba*, *ačĩns-pa*, P. *bčĩns*, F. *bčĩn*, Imp. *ačĩn(s)* to bind, to tie up, to fetter. (Isolated root.)
- (10) *abyug-pa*, P. and Imp. *byugs* to wet, to moisten; to smear, to spread over, to anoint (w. *-la*); to stroke, to pat (w. *-la*). (Isolated root.)
- (11) *bgod-pa*, P. and Imp. *bgos*, F. *bgo* to divide, to distribute. (Isolated root.)

§ 32. *b-*, *a-* also occurs with neuter (inactive intransitive) verbs, where it is equivalent to *m-*, among others the following :

*bde-ba* to be happy, to be well.

*bsod-pa* to be pleased with, to take delight in.

*bgre-ba*, P. *bgres* to grow old.

*bšes-pa* to know, to be acquainted with.

*bžugs-pa* to be seated ; to dwell, to reside ; to remain, to stay,  
to exist, to live.

*bkres-pa* to be hungry.

*agum-pa*, P. *gum*, *agums* to die.

*ažad-pa*, P. *žad* to be on the decline, to become exhausted,  
to dwindle.

and many others.

This weakening of the verbal force to one descriptive of state or condition seems to be the regular tendency with verbs provided with a subject prefix only.<sup>1</sup>

The explanation is probably to be sought in the inherently very weak, almost substantival, nature of the verb root, which, as already noted, is not much more than the mere name of an action or state, into which basic meaning such roots will relapse, especially when relieved of active transitive duty by a stronger form with directive infix.

§ 33. In this way it is easy to understand why verbs in *a-*, when forming pairs with forms in *s-*, have in most cases, an inactive intransitive sense.<sup>2</sup> From an original active meaning they have been enabled to sink back into inactive senses by the strong active transitive force of their *s-* relatives, which have assumed the entire burden in this respect.

Representative pairs in which this has occurred are the following :—

*abar-ba* to catch fire, to blaze, to beam.

*sbar-ba*, *sbor-ba* to light, to kindle, to inflame.

*abrel-ba* to hang together, to cohere.

*sbrél-ba* to stitch together, to fasten on.

*abyor-ba*, *abyar-ba* to stick together, to adhere ; to be prepared.

*sbyor-ba*, P. and F. *sbyar* to stick, to attach, to affix ; to prepare.

*agul-ba* to shake, to be agitated, to shiver, to tremble.

(*sgul-ba*, P. and F. *bsgul* to move, to agitate, to put in motion.)

<sup>1</sup> Compare the behaviour of *m-* verbs (§ 26 *sup.*), and, again, see Kachin, §§ 80, 69, below.

<sup>2</sup> This contrast was clearly recognized by Conrady (*CB.*, 20), but his suggestion that the prefix *a-* is a copula is certainly mistaken.

*ākum-pa*, P. *kums* to shrink, to become contracted.

*skum-pa*, P. *bskums*, F. *bskum*, Imp. *skum(s)* to contract, to draw in (as the leg).

*aggyur-ba*, P. and Imp. *gyur* to undergo change, to be altered.

*sggyur-ba*, P. and F. *bsgyur* to transfer, to change, to alter.

*agyel-ba*, P. and Imp. *gyel* to fall, to tumble.

*sgyel-ba*, P. and F. *bsgyel* to throw or put down, to overthrow.

*agrig-pa* to suit, to agree, to correspond.

*sgrig-pa*, P. *bsgrigs*, F. *bsgrig*, Imp. *sgrig(s)* to lay or put in order, to arrange, to adjust, to fit together.

*agrib-pa*, P. *grib* to grow less, to decrease, to be diminished; to grow dim or dark.

*sgrib-pa*, P. *bsgribs*, F. *bsgrib*, Imp. *sgrib(s)* to deprive of light, to darken, to obscure.

*agril-ba*, P. *gril* to be twisted or wrapped round.

*sgril-ba*, P. and F. *bsgril* to wind or wrap round, to roll, wrap or wind up.

*agrub-pa*, P. *grub* to be made ready, to be finished.

*sgrub-pa*, P. *bsgrubs*, F. *bsgrub*, Imp. *sgrub(s)* to complete, to finish.

*agren-ba* to stand, to be standing.

*sgren-ba*, P. *bsgrens*, F. *bsgren*, Imp. *sgren(s)* to set up, to raise, to erect.

*agrol-ba*, P. *grol* to become free, to be released from.

*sgrol-ba*, P. and F. *bsgral* to set free, to rescue, to deliver.

*aggyag-pa* to be sold, spent, or expended.

*skyag-pa*, P. *bskyags*, F. *bskyag*, Imp. *skyog* to spend, to lay out, to expend.

*ākōl-ba*, P. *kōl* to be boiling; to effervesce, to sparkle.

*skōl-ba*, P. and F. *bskōl* to boil, to bring to a boil.

*ākȳol-ba*, P. *ākȳol* to be carried, to be brought.

*skyel-ba*, P. and F. *bskyel*, Imp. *skyol* to convey, to bring, to conduct.

*adum-pa* to be reconciled with.

*sdum-pa*, P. *bsdums*, F. *bsdum*, Imp. *sdum(s)* to make agree, to bring to an agreement, to conciliate.

*āpel-ba*, P. *pēl* to increase, to enlarge, to grow.

*spel-ba* to augment, to make increase.

*āpro-ba*, P. *āpros* to emanate or proceed from, to spread (intr.).

*spro-ba*, P. *spros* to make go out, to disperse.

*aprod-pa*, P. *prod* to have been delivered or transmitted.

*sprod-pa*, *sprad-pa* to bring together, to make meet, to deliver.

*abub-pa*, P. *bub*, Imp. *bub(s)* to be turned over or upside down.

*spub-pa*, P. *spubs* to turn upside down, to invert.

*aɸar-ba* to rebound (of stones), to fly up (of sparks), to splash up (of water).

*spar-ba*, *spor-ba*, P. and F. *spar* to lift up, to raise.

*abyuñ-ba*, P. and Imp. *byuñ* to be said, to be told.

*sbyoñ-ba*, P. *sbyaṅs*, F. *sbyaṅ*, to recite, to repeat.

*abyoñ-ba* to be cleansed.

*sbyoñ-ba*, P. *sbyaṅs*, F. *sbyaṅ* to clean, to remove by cleaning.

*adre-ba*, P. and Imp. *adres* to be mixed with.

*sre-ba*, P. *bsres*, F. *bsre*, Imp. *(b)sres* to mix together, to mingle, to admix.

## 2. Directive or Objective Infixes

§ 34. These must always stand next to the root, upon the action of which they have a directive influence, and are represented by *-d-*, *-g-*, *-r-*, *-l-*, and *-s-*.

They are dependent,<sup>1</sup> that is, they originally could not occur alone before verb roots, but were necessarily preceded by the subject prefix *b-*, as the sequel will show.

The values of these infixes appear, originally at least, to have been of direction, with or without motion: *to*, *into*, *towards*; *in*, *on*, *upon*, *against*, an external object, carrying a general sense of *motion in the direction of*.

It seems furthermore probable that they were intended to repeat in the verb the force of the foregoing suffix attached to the object earlier in the sentence, forming in this way a type of construction comparable to those not infrequent in Latin: *in flumen influere*, *ad suspiciones accedere*, *ex hibernis educere*,

<sup>1</sup> The writer regards it as quite a mistake to believe that these elements could ever occur alone before the root in the ancient language. It is true that in the seventh century orthography they do so, but it is obvious that we can no more accept the evidence of this orthography as final for the pre-classical period than we can accept the modern dialectical forms of, for instance, Central Tibetan, for proof of facts relative to the seventh century, and the writer would rather stress here the importance of the four "roots" for the reconstruction of old verb forms, for they furnish evidence which, when used synthetically, gives us proof so strong that the "prefix" *s-*, *r-*, *l-*, and perhaps *d-* and *g-* (v. § 35 *inf.*) of the classical present form was an infix in the ancient language that it can hardly be denied.

etc., as the infixes contain the same consonants<sup>1</sup> as the suffixes *-du*, *-ru*, *-r*, *-la*, *-su*, and carry the same force.

This mechanism, indeed, may be definitely traced in specific instances where it still persists with a verb in *-d-*, *-g-*, *-r-*, *-l-*, *-s-*, as against a related root with only the subject prefix *b-* or *m-*.

So we find, e.g. *rʃed-pa*, P. and F. *brʃed* to honour, to pay reverence to (a dative person in *-la*), as against *mčod-pa* to respect, to revere, to honour (an accusative person); *rgol-ba*, P. and F. *brgol* to oppose, to offer resistance to (a dative object in *-la*), as against *agal-ba* to be in opposition to, to be at variance with (an object in *dan*).

There is, indeed, evidence that sometimes the verbal infix was felt to be of sufficient strength to take over the whole objective force itself, and allow the omission of the suffix with the object.

In the case of *-s-*, which appears to have been a particularly forceful element, we thus find, for instance: *bla-ma mčas-pa bsten-no* as against *bla-ma mčas-pa-la brten-no* He adhered to a learned lama, and again: *rkañ-pa bsnad* as against *rkañ-pa-la gnod* He has suffered injury to (his) foot.

It is readily evident in such cases, how, by entirely absorbing into itself the directive connection with the object, such verb forms would give rise to what have been called "causative" or "transitive" forms from basically intransitive roots, though these terms are rather illusory.

It is probable that in not a few roots we have now only a substitute infix which has taken the place of some other earlier one, long ago retired by rigid sequence laws which grew up and prohibited its employment with the initial of that particular root.

For it is almost certain that the fixed sequences of prefix (or infix) and initial which now rule the language are not

<sup>1</sup> Cf. § 57. The basic identity of form between the verbal infixes *-r-*, *-s-*, *-d-*, and the case particles *-ru*, *-su*, *-du* may be questioned. Yet it should be remembered that we have no actual proof that the consonants in *-ru*, *-su*, *-du*, *-tu* are euphonic only, as suggested by Laufer (T'oung Pao, vol. xv (1914), pp. 58-9).

Bacot (*Les Śloka Grammaticaux*, p. 16, n. 1), on the other hand, supposes that *-s* may be original, and only *-r(u)*, *-d(u)*, *-t(u)* euphonic.

But among these, *-r* can function alone, and can consequently hardly be regarded as used to produce euphony only.

If, then, *-s* and *-r* (in *-su* and *-ru*) may be original, is *-d(u)* necessarily euphonic? *-t* (in *-tu*) seems, in fact, to the writer probably the only form of this nature—substituted for *-d(u)* after final *-g*, *-b*, and *da drag*.

original to it. They do not exist in any of its more southerly relatives where any vestige of a vowel remains with the prefix, though substitutes occur in some cases where the vowel has fallen out.<sup>1</sup> And it is almost equally certain that originally the prefixes of Tibetan were vocalized.<sup>2</sup>

*d-, g-*

§ 35. These two elements, which are merely phonetic complements of each other, present a problem of their own, as no direct evidence can be adduced that they were ever infixes at all.

The writer, however, is inclined to believe that they were, and that we have in the *d-* and *g-* verbs (§§ 15, 16, 17) four separate forms of what were once verbs in *bd-* and *bg-*.

Of this, however, we have no direct proof, phonetic laws governing sequence having for long been in operation which would automatically have eliminated them prior to the reduction of the language to writing. But these laws are most certainly not an original possession of the language (*v.* § 8).

That *d-* and *g-* now remain particularly before future roots in the so-called "multiple-rooted" verbs, is especially significant in any attempt to show that they were once infixed directives, for this is just the tense in which we should expect to find them linger. A particle of approach, "to, into, towards," would naturally feel at home here.

Proof of this is at hand from other sources. In Âhom Grierson<sup>3</sup> has noticed it. In that language *tî* is a dative sign before substantives, and a future sign before verbs,<sup>4</sup> "to going" and "will go" being, as Grierson remarks, easily convertible expressions in a language making no distinction between substantives and verbs.

§ 36. Evidence as to the value of *d-* and *g-* is furnished again by instances of interchange between themselves and definitely directive infixes, such as occur in:—

*gêe-ba* to esteem, to hold dear, to feel love for  
and *brtse-ba* to love, to feel affection for.

*gdal-ba, bdal-ba*  
and *rdal-ba*, P. and F. *brdal*, Imp. *rdol* to spread out, to extend, to cover over.

<sup>1</sup> See § 149 *inf.*

<sup>2</sup> See § 24 *sup.*, and *inter alia*: Conrady, *CB.*, 53; Francke, *ZDMG.*, Bd. 57 (1903), p. 295.

<sup>3</sup> *ZDMG.*, Bd. 56 (1902), pp. 15 and 22.

<sup>4</sup> This association is found again in the Indonesian languages. *v.* Brandstetter, *Das Verbum . . . in vierundzwanzig indonesischen Sprachen*, p. 23.



In addition to this, there are, in a certain number of cases, verbs in three forms, one with *g-*, another with *b-*, and a third either without any prefix at all or with *a-*.

In these, the division is not according to tense, and they are probably to be regarded as the now sundered fragments of formerly single united forms.

Instances are the following :—

*gtug-pa*, P. *gtugs* to reach, to touch, also *btug-pa* and *tug-pa*.

*gtub-pa* to be able, also *btub-pa* id., and *tub-pa* to be able to cope with.

*gtub(s)-pa* to cut up, also *btub(s)-pa* and *atub-pa*, P. *atubs*, F. *gtub*, Imp. *atub*, *btub*.

*gtum-pa* to wrap up, to cover, *btum-pa* to wrap round, to envelop, *atum-pa*, P. *atums*, *btums*, F. *btum*, Imp. *atum*, *btum* to cover, to wrap up or round, to envelop.

*gtog-pa* to gather, to pluck, also *btog-pa* id., and *atogs-pa*, P. and Imp. *atogs* to take, to seize.

*gšo-ba*, P. *gšos* to pour out, also *bšo-ba*, P. *bšos*.

Sometimes the form in *b-*, *a-* is recoverable only from sources outside Tibetan.

Äo *ä-* (= T. *a-*, *b-*, v. § 139) supplies it in :—

Äo *ä-ji(-dān)* to look for, to see, as against T. *gzig-pa* to search for, *gzigs-pa* to see.

Äo *ä-yip*<sup>1</sup> to fan, as against T. *gyab-mo*, *yab-mo* the act of fanning.

Äo *ä-len* to press, to squeeze, as against T. *glem-pa*.<sup>2</sup>

The numerous substantives with prefixed *d-* or *g-* are important in connection with *d-* and *g-* with verbs, for, in some instances at least, it is probable that they represent verb Perfects (frequently in *-s*) which have come simply to name substantivally the condition attained, the object arrived at or moved towards, following the verbal action, and that they are actually forms of locative condition, the sense into which the directive prefix itself is the immediate cause of the verb root's projection. The directive in prefixed position acts here just as when suffixed *-r* projects *dgu(-ba)* to bend, to make

<sup>1</sup> Lhôtā *e-sáp*.

<sup>2</sup> I list this even though *g-* is not regarded as a prefix here. The point, however, is not certain in all cases. See the various observations on this in Schrader's most valuable paper, *Siamese Mute h*, Asia Major, vol. iii, pp. 33-48.

crooked, into an adjective of condition attained: *dgu-r* bent, crooked.

It is possible, for instance, that in this way *dbaṅ* might, power, potency, originated from a now only theoretical verb \**b-d-baṅ* (> *a-d-baṅ*) to be *in* a position of power, to come *into* authority, the directive element's having projected the root into a locative sense of condition attained by the acting subject. In this particular instance it may be noticed that the related form *abaṅs* subject, subjects, people (lit. (those) subjected, perf. in -s) carries a Perfect sense descriptive of the object subjected, and not the "locative" condition which the subject attains, or, in other words names the object *upon* which the power is exercised.

In other cases it seems not improbable that *d-* and *g-* forms are projections *into* the future state in which the verbal action normally terminates.

Instances of this are, in fact, not far to seek. We have, for instance:—

*dbye-ba* subst. parting, partition, division, distinction, classification; section, part, class, species, the future of *abyed-pa*, P. and Imp. *pye*, *pyed*, *pyes*, F. *dbye*, vb. act. to open, to separate, to keep asunder, to divide; to classify, to sort.

*gžug* subst. end, extremity, coccyx, rump, or ventlet (of birds) (= *mjug*, q.v. § 26), the future of *ajug-pa*, P. *bčug*, F. *gžug*, Imp. *čug* vb. act. to put in or into; to add on (as prefixed or suffixed letters).

*gžu(-mo)* subst. bow (for shooting), arch, the future (?) of *gčud-pa*, P. *gčus*, F. *gču*, Imp. *gčus* (?), vb. act. to turn, to twist, to plait, to bend round.

*gžom-pa* adj. bent, bruised (of vessels), in WT., the future of *ažoms-pa*, P. *bčom*, F. *gžom*, Imp. *čom* vb. act. to subdue, to oppress, to treat with violence, to plunder, to despoil.

On the other hand, such substantives may be merely lapsed verb forms. See § 47.

The writer believes in this connection that there is a sharp distinction to be drawn between Tibetan *d-* substantives in all cases and those in *de-*, *te-* of Jyarung (§ 146), for the pronominal origin of the prefix in Jyarung substantives unconnected with any verb form cannot be supposed for any similar *d-* forms of Tibetan. Laufer's suggestion<sup>1</sup> that the prefix in Tibetan may be a numerative would itself separate it definitely from Jyarung *de-*, *te-*. But although it may be tempting to try to thus account for the Tibetan prefix in certain of the more closely

<sup>1</sup> T'oung Pao, xv, No. 1 (March, 1914), pp. 108-9.

knit sense groups of the language (e.g. *dgun* winter, *dbyar* summer, *dpyid* spring, etc.), especially when the substantives concerned cannot be traced to connection with any known verb form, the whole "numerative" idea in Tibetan must remain for the moment in doubt.<sup>1</sup>

When verbal connection can be traced in Tibetan, and the substantive represents a perfect form projected into a substantival sense, this again does not occur in Jyarung, even if (as is possible) some such forms may have survived in it, forms which would now naturally be entirely obscured by identification with the later pronominal element of similar form. In Jyarung, however, we are dealing with an entirely distinct and much younger prefix, even if its initial introduction may have been assisted in part by the older tendencies of Tibetan.

It is then evident that not only is the uncertainty of word-type (verb, substantive or other sense) the cause of the same form's appearing as either verb or substantive as desired, but the possible meanings into which the root may be led are also largely conditioned by the basic force of the prefix.

The root *dun*, for instance, in the form *gdun-ba* comes to carry both the verbal sense of "to desire, to long for" (*g-*), and that of a substantive (state assumed, condition attained—locative *g-*) in "desire, longing, lust".

-7-

§ 37. This infix, the directive value of which is particularly clear, is also the one which can best be traced at a later date, still functioning in the younger languages where we shall find it again in Mikir (§ 164), Êmpêo (§ 177), and the Old Kuki group (§ 165).

It is especially conspicuous with verbs carrying a sense of action or motion, either—

(a) with contact = "against, upon, to, into, over, through," etc., or

(b) without contact = "at, towards, out, forth, away," etc., and is consequently common with verbs of striking, beating, cutting; speaking, entreating, longing, and the like.

As typifying the two divisions above, may be given:—

(a) *rgyug-pa*, P. *brgyugs*, F. *brgyug* to run, hasten, hurry, or rush (to or against).

*rgyab-pa*, P. and F. *brgyab*, Imp. *rgyob* to hit, to beat, to strike.

*rgol-ba*, P. and F. *brgol* to dispute, to combat, to fight against.

<sup>1</sup> See the writer's remarks in *Language*, Journ. Ling. Soc. Am., vol. iv (1928), p. 279.

*rdug-pa*, P. *brdugs*, F. *brdug* to conquer, to vanquish, to annihilate, to destroy; to strike against, to stumble over.

*rduñ-ba*, P. *brduñs*, F. *brduñ*, Imp. (b)*rduñs* to beat, to strike.

*rdeg(s)-pa*, P. (b)*rdeg*s, F. *brdeg*, Imp. (b)*rdeg(s)*, to beat, to strike, to smite.

*rdeb(s)-pa*, *rdab-pa*, P. *brdabs*, F. *brdab* to throw down violently, to fling or knock down (*sa-la* upon the ground).

*rko-ba*, P. (b)*rkos*, F. *brko*, Imp. *rkos* to dig, to hoe; to engrave.

*rña-ba*, P. *brñas*, F. *brña*, Imp. *rños* to cut through, to mow, to reap.

*rtol-ba*, P. *brtol* to bore into, to pierce, to perforate; to come to, to arrive at.

*rmo-ba*, *rmod-pa*, *rmed-pa*, P. and Imp. *rmos* to plough, to sow and plough in.

*rma-ba*, P. *rmās* to wound.

§ 38. Without contact:—

(b) *rjed-pa*, P. and Imp. *brjed* to honour, to pay reverence to (w. dat.).

*rtēn-pa*, P. and F. *brten*, Imp. *rtēn* to be situated or face towards.

*rkam-pa* to desire, to long for (w. dat.)

*rñam-pa*, *rñams-pa*, P. *brñams* to desire earnestly, to pant for (w. dat.); to rush towards, to fly at (w. dat.).

*rñab-pa* to desire, to crave, to wish for.

*rñon-pa*, P. and F. *brñon* to hunt, to pursue, to chase after.

*brtson-pa* to strive for, to aim at, to apply oneself to.

*rmed-pa* (also *smed-pa*), P. *rmes* to ask, to address an inquiry to.

*rjod-pa*, P. and F. *brjod* to say, to pronounce, to utter, to speak out, to set forth.

*rkyoñ-ba*, P. and F. *brkyañ* to stretch, to extend, to put forth (as the hand or tongue).

*rdol-ba*, P. and F. *brdol* to come out, to break forth, to issue; to come up, to sprout, or shoot forth (as seed).

*rdal-ba*, P. and F. *brdal*, Imp. *rdol* to extend, to spread out.

-l-

§ 39. This infix, which is not very common with verbs, appears in quite a few instances in association with a

specialized directive sense of "together" (without penetration), most closely related to that of "direction to" (with contact).

Although the case for this force of *-l-* cannot be made out strongly, since the sense is naturally inherent in the verb root itself, its occurrence with such roots is not without a certain significance, especially when it is persistent in a closely related series such as we evidently have in the following :—

*ltab-pa*, P. *bltab*, F. *bltab*, Imp. *ltob* to fold, lay or put together.

*lteb-pa* to double over, to turn in (*i.e.* together, as a hem).

*ldeb-pa* to bend round or back, to double down (together).

*ldab-pa*, P. *bldabs*, F. *bldab*, Imp. *ldob* to do again, to repeat (lit. ? : to double, to do (twice) together).

*-l-* verbs fall otherwise under the same heads as already given for those in *-r-*, instances of which are :—

§ 40. (a) with contact = against, upon, to, into, over, through, etc.

*ldig-pa* to fall or sink through.

*ldin-ba* to be swimming or floating (upon).

*ldug(s)-pa*, P. *ldugs*, *blugs*, F. *blug*, Imp. *blug(s)* to strew, to cast ; to found.

*ljen-pa* to enter, to penetrate.

§ 41. (b) without contact = at, towards, out, forth, away, etc.

*lta-ba*, P. *bltas*, F. *blta*, Imp. *ltos*, *blta*.

(a) to look (as an act of the will), to view.

(b) to inspect (*ccd.*, rarely *ca.*), to examine, to try, to look into.

(c) to look upon, to regard (*ccd.* (or *acc.*) and *term.*).

(d) to have regard to, to pay attention to, to take notice of (*ccd.*, rarely *term.*).

(e) to be situated or directed towards.

*lde-ba*, P. (b)*ldes*, F. *blde*, Imp. *ldes* to warm oneself (w. *acc.* *me* at the fire, etc.).

In Kachin we shall later (§ 85) find a system of prefix concord well in evidence between many verbs and the part of the body involved in the action they name.

It is possible that we have instances of this in Tibetan also. *ldag-pa*, P. *bldags*, F. *bldag*, Imp. *ldog* to lick, looks like such an attempt at concord with *lce* resp. *ljags* tongue, as does likewise *ldad-pa*, P. and F. *bldad*, Imp. *ldod* to chew (cf. also

*ldan-pa* cheek). Similarly *ltogs-pa* to be hungry, agrees with *lto-ba* stomach.

-s-

§ 42. This infix is particularly frequent with verb roots in transitive and causative senses, such roots frequently standing, as has been noticed above (§ 33), opposite intransitive members in *a*-, with which in such cases they form pairs.

It is probable that originally -s- was a directive indicating simply either (*a*) general direction into the condition or state named by the verb root itself, or (*b*) (as its fullest extension in an objective direction) action to, towards, for, etc., an indirect object. As a later development (*c*) the so-called transitive or causative verbs in -s- probably arose.

In verbs of class (*a*) the infix -s- may be regarded as a terminative element assisting the verb root to pass the subject *into* the state or condition which it itself names, the indirect object being, in fact, the verb concept itself. Thus *sgaṇ-ba* (\**b-s-gaṇ*) to become full, is really to come *into* (-s-) a state of fullness (ind. obj.). In these, the objective connection may be said to be internal.

Among such verbs are :—

*skraṇ-ba*, P. *skraṇs* to become swollen, to swell.

*sṇo-ba*, *sṇod-pa*, P. *bsṇos*, F. *bsṇo*, Imp. *sṇos* to become green.

*stor-ba* to be or become lost, to go astray.

*sbo-ba*, P. *sbos* to become swollen or distended.

*sbrid-pa* to become numb or torpid.

*smin-pa* to become ripe.

§ 43. In verbs of class (*b*) -s- may be regarded as definitely directive towards an indirect object which is external.

In some few instances these forms are naturally paralleled by forms with -r-, the connection being with a definite external, but indirect, object not named in the verb.

Verbs descriptive of sentiment or feeling towards external objects or conditions naturally occur here.

As typical of class (*b*) we have among others :—

*skam-pa* to long *for* (= *rkam-pa*).

*skom-pa* to be thirsty, to thirst *for*.

*skyo-ba* to be weary of, to feel an aversion *for*.

*skrag-pa* to be terrified *at*, to feel fear of.

*sgom-pa*, P. *bsgom*s, F. *bsgom*, Imp. *sgom(s)* to regard, to look *upon* (w. acc.).

*sgrog-pa*, P. *bsgrags*, F. *bsgrag*, Imp. *sgrag(s)* to call out *to*, to shout *at*.

*sñe-ba*, P. *bsñes*, F. *bsñe*, Imp. *sñe* to lean *against*, to rest upon (w. -*la*).

*sñeg(s)-pa*, P. *bsñegs*, F. *bsñeg*, Imp. *sñog(s)* to hasten or run *to or towards*, to strive or struggle *for*, to aspire *to* (w. -*la*).

*sñen-pa* to come or go near *to*.

*sñog-pa*, *bsñog-pa* to wish earnestly *for*, to lust *after* (secondary form of *sñeg(s)-pa* sup.).

*stiñ-ba*, P. *bstiñs*, F. *bstiñ*, Imp. *stiñs* to rebuke, to scold, to hurl abuse *at*.

*sten-pa*, P. and F. *bsten*, Imp. *sten* to adhere *to*, to stick *to*, to rely upon (= *rten-pa*, but. w. acc.).

*sdañ-ba*, P. *sdañs* to be angry or wrathful with, to hate, to be inimically disposed *towards* (gen. w. -*la*).

*snad-pa*, P. *bsnad*, Imp. *snod* to hurt, to harm, to do injury *to* (w. acc.).

*spro-ba*, P. *spro* to delight in, to feel inclination *for*.

*sbrel-ba* to stitch *to*, to sew or fasten *on*, to connect or join *together*.

*sbron-pa*, P. and F. *sbran* to send *for*, to call *to*, to give information or notice *to*.

*smon-pa* to wish, to desire, to long *for* (w. -*la*).

§ 44. From these two classes of -*s*- verb it is probable that those which are now the most typical of -*s*- may have grown up, i.e. (c) those in which a definite external direct object is the goal towards which -*s*- *apparently* directs the verbal action.

This growth, indeed, is forecast by the verbs of both (a) and (b), for projection either into a given state or condition (ind. obj.), or movement to, into, towards, etc., some concrete indirect object is the natural fate of the direct object in the so-called transitive or causative verb.

Verbs of this class need hardly be enumerated here. Many have already been given in § 33 (*q.v.*) opposite intransitive members in *a*-.

§ 45. It is possible that this use of -*s*- was largely aided by the analogy of the instrumental suffix -*s* of the substantive—the suffix of *cause*. -*s*- with the verb may, indeed, have come to be felt as a suffix to the subject prefix *b*-, showing that through or by means of (-*s*) that subject, the verbal action immediately following came about, i.e. that by (-*s*) him (*b*-) it was *caused*.

Then *b-s-grig*, for example, would in this light have been regarded as “because (-s) of an acting subject (*b-*) an agreement came about”, i.e. (he) cause(d) to be in agreement (intr. *agrig-pa*), *b-s-gyur* as “through (-s) an acting subject (*b-*) a change occurred”, i.e. (he) cause(d) to be changed (intr. *aggyur-ba*).

This would, in fact, be an exact replica of the construction of the independent instrumental subject. In *kō-s mi rta-ru bskyon*, for example, *b-s* (< \**ba-su*?) would have been felt to exactly repeat *kō-s* element for element, -s in the verb having been withdrawn from indicating direction towards the indirect object, where it would have repeated the force of -*ru*, to give (by analogy with, and under direct influence of, -s in *kō-s*) an instrumental sense to the subject prefix *b-*, with consequently a “causative” sense to the verb with inevitable direction towards the direct object (here *mi*).

That this, however, was not the original conception is shown by the existence of the (a) and (b) class verbs.

Taking a representative sentence with an -s- verb, the original linkage may be shown thus :—

$$\begin{array}{c} | \qquad \qquad \qquad | \\ de-rnams-kyis \ rdzin-du \ | \ \check{c}u^{\Delta} \ bskyil-lo. \\ | \qquad \qquad \qquad | \end{array}$$

They collected the water into a lake.

While later, for the reasons above outlined, it was felt to stand as follows :—

$$\begin{array}{c} | \qquad \qquad \qquad | \\ | \qquad \qquad \qquad | \\ de-rnams-kyis \ rdzin-du \ | \ \check{c}u^{\Delta} \ bskyil-lo. \\ | \qquad \qquad \qquad | \end{array}$$

In the first place, of course, in the form first given, there is no more “causative” force in the -s- verb than there is in :

$$\begin{array}{c} | \qquad \qquad \qquad | \\ kos \ bsam-yas-su \ | \ b^{\Delta}sn̄en-na. \\ | \qquad \qquad \qquad | \end{array}$$

As he approached Samye.

i.e. As he (*b-*) came towards (-s-) Samye.



§ 46. Upon the factors which have operated to keep a certain number of -s- verbs in classes (a) and (b), we have light from the following case.

In Ladakhi there is a form *agrog-če*<sup>1</sup> to be disturbed, to become alarmed, to take fright, opposite *dkrog-pa*, *skrog-pa*, transitive verbs, to rouse, to scare up, which anciently paralleled *akrug-pa*, P. *akrugs* to be disturbed or in commotion, opposite *dkrug-pa* (col. *šrug-če*), P. *dkrugs* to trouble, to disturb.

But this root *agrog(-pa)* is not now found elsewhere in the language, and its absence is probably the immediate reason why we have *skrag-pa* to become alarmed or take fright at, still remaining as an intransitive verb. It was compelled to remain in its original sense to fill what otherwise would have been a gap in the language when *agrog(-pa)* was for some reason dropped.

§ 47. And so, the writer believes, must the material offered us by the Tibetan verb, be interpreted.

The very fact that the native grammarians attempt to find a meaning for the prefixes only with the verb is itself sufficiently significant, for they were almost certainly peculiar only to the verb in the archaic language, and were, indeed, elements without which the verb could not occur in connected speech.<sup>2</sup>

It is for this reason that beside verbs now without prefix the language so often preserves a parallel form with prefix. Beside *šes-pa* there is thus *bšes-pa* to know, beside *za-ba* is *bza-ba* to eat, beside *nod-pa* is *mnod-pa* to receive, beside *tug-pa* are *btug-pa* and *gtug-pa*, and many more, where the member without prefix is simply an abraded form.

It is for this same reason also that the verb so frequently runs its so-called "Perfect" or "Future" form as a secondary verb parallel to the more abraded "Present", as with *bšad-pa* the "Perfect" and "Future" of *ačad-pa* to explain, *bčo-ba* (WT.) the "Future" of *ačos-pa* to make, and others, in which there can be no reasonable doubt that the form in *b-* with a following surd is nearer the original (*\*ba-šad*, *\*ba-čo*) than that with *a-* and an aspirated initial.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thus in the Kesarsage. See A. H. Francke, *Der Frühlingsmythus der Kesarsage*, iii, 47 (p. 7), *ra-ma de agrog-ste ko akur-te ri gsum-mi rtse-la akyers*, "the goat, in fright, carrying him away, brought him to the summit of Three Mountains."

<sup>2</sup> Compare § 10, *sup.*

<sup>3</sup> c. § 29, *sup.*

Conversely the archaic substantive does not appear to have ever originally possessed prefixes. Numbers of the most primitive words of this nature throughout the language are without them : *mi* man, *lus* body, *lag* hand, *mig* eye, *so* tooth, *ša* flesh, and many more.

It is in direct line with this that we have such constructions as *žal mjal-ba* to visit, to come and see (lit. to face the face), *čū aču-ba* to water (lit. to water water), *gom-pa bgom-pa* to make steps (lit. to step steps), *kur qkur-ba* to carry a load, *kal agel-ba* to load (lit. to load a load), *lags aľag-pa* to weave (lit. to weave a web), and others, formed with a substantive without, and a verb with, a prefix.<sup>1</sup>

That so many substantives occur now with prefixes is nothing against this. The writer has attempted above<sup>2</sup> to show with certain *m-* forms, that a weakly constituted *m-*verb will lapse into substantival sense carrying its prefix with it. The same principle applies with frequency with verbs having other prefixes also.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to this, what is now the prefix of a substantive is altogether too often of entirely different origin, as Laufer<sup>4</sup> has successfully demonstrated, and represents a root which originally formed with the following word a species of synonym-compound, with the second member of which it only later became telescoped as a "prefix".

With the verb, then, we have prefixed elements representing an archaic scheme of subjective and objective linkage.

<sup>1</sup> Only in the sense that the prefix is peculiar to the verb-noun root when used in its verbal aspect can it be said to be a "denominative" element. The verb-noun root alone is already verbal in such constructions, and only as an after-act calls its subjective companion (*m-*, *b-*, *a-*) to itself to make the fact clear. The prefix, thus, never functions as a "denominative" formative as Conrady thought, and there is no "Denominativ-Bildung" here.

<sup>2</sup> § 26.

<sup>3</sup> We find such transplanted verb forms forming pairs with their own verb root just as the true substantive does in the examples above.

Thus, there is : *gcin gčid-pa*, *gčín gči-ba* to urinate, where *gčín* comes down from the old "Perfect" *\*(b)gčín(d)* (v. § 55); *agron-du agro-ba* to go on travels, to go abroad, where *agron* is also probably derived from a "Perfect" *\*(b)gron(d)* (cf. *agron-pa* (Cs.) = *agrod-pa*, *bgrod-pa* to go, to walk, probably an archaism, as verbs of this series have very largely assumed final *-d*, possibly by analogy with the "terminative" case of nouns (v. § 57), since motion is involved).

The position is, indeed, in rarer instances, entirely reversed, and the prefix is retained by the substantive of "Perfect" origin, while the verb, through abrasion, has lost it. So in *bion-pa ľon-pa* to mount a riding beast or carriage.

<sup>4</sup> *The Si-Hia Language: A Study in Indo-Chinese Philology*, T'oung Pao, vol. xvii (1916), pp. 1-126.



It is naturally the most marked between *m*- verbs and those with directive elements, for the typical *m*- verb is one in which there is named only an unchanging state or condition of the subject <sup>1</sup>—literally, for example : its (*m*-) smelling (*nam(-pa)*), his (*m*-) being (*na(-ba)*), his (*m*-) sleeping (*nal(-ba)*), etc.

Set against this inactive subject there is naturally lacking the objective connection found with other verbs, and the typical verb in *m*- carries in its sentence at most a species of locative object (of place, condition, ownership or time) in which no movement occasioned by the subject is involved.

This locative <sup>2</sup> object takes the place of that embodying motion dependent upon an act of the subject with verbs having other prefixes, but unlike them, since it does not owe its condition to subjective action, calls for no directive link in the verb.

The contrast may be shown thus :—

|                      |  
*de ma ˘on-bar* <sup>3</sup> *m<sup>Δ</sup>foñ-nas.*

As he saw (or, Upon his <sup>4</sup> seeing) his mother coming.

|                      |  
*kos kyi-la rdo<sup>Δ</sup>* *brgyab-nas.*  
                              |                      |

He, having thrown a stone at the dog.

It is also very clear that in such constructions with *m*-, a *de ñid* term is to be understood as embodied in the prefix : *mkyen-pa* knowing (within the subject's self<sup>Δ</sup>), *mñon-pa* being

<sup>1</sup> *v. § 26 sup.*

<sup>2</sup> The term must here be taken to include both (a) motion of the object itself when not occasioned by the subject, as in *de ma ˘on-bar mñon-nas*, given here, where *˘on-bar* = "in motion" (locative of condition), and (b) motion into an objective state : *kyi ñur mñons-so* The dog jumped into the water (locative of position).

In the more modern language of Western Tibet this root well shows its original nature on frequent occasions. So, e.g. in the Kesarasage, *Frühling-smythus*, iii, 46 (ed. Francke, 1900), we have *ko dei ka mñons blañs* "Er sprang auf sie", where *ka* is pure (stationary) locative with a literal meaning of "surface" (oberfläche), and does not imply motion at all.

<sup>3</sup> Locative of condition.

<sup>4</sup> The psychologically genitive nature of the subject restated by *m*- may nearly always be clearly seen, as again in : *bsam-pa dag-par mkyen-pa* As he perceived (or, Upon his (*m*-, gen.) perceiving) (their) sentiments to be sincere ; *bden-par ñis mñon* From what is it evident that this is true ? (lit. For what reason its (*m*-, gen.) being evident as true ?).

evident (on the part of the subject itself<sup>Δ</sup>), *m̃na-ba* being (personally<sup>Δ</sup>), *m̃cōns-ba* leaping (on the part of the subject himself<sup>Δ</sup>), and in this is the explanation of the frequently "reflexive" force of this element.<sup>1</sup>

The early growth of this system may probably be summarized historically as follows, taking the two root types which appear to have been basic in the language, i.e. (a) those potentially either substantive or verb, (b) those potentially either adjective or verb.

### A. PROTO-TIBETAN

Undifferentiated Root (a)		Undifferentiated Root (b)	
Substantive	Verb	Adjective	Verb
Neuter, Intr., Tr., Caus.		Neuter, Intr., Tr., Caus.	

At first, in the early stages of the language, the appropriate root *without prefixes* was selected by the speaker and projected mentally into the sentence as a verb *already carrying within itself the meaning desired*, i.e. neuter, intransitive, transitive, or so-called "causative".

As a secondary operation, to make this plain, co-ordinating or link prefixes were placed before it to make clear the attendant interrelation between it and its subject and object.

\*                      \*                      \*                      \*

Some time before the language was reduced to writing, this fell into decay.

The subjective and objective connections of the root when in verbal usage were regarded as sufficiently clearly expressed by the independent subject and object, carrying suffixes for the purpose, earlier in the sentence.

The internal dynamics of the root + prefix block, however, carried it on without change in outward form, but with the old meaning of the prefixes rapidly falling away.

At this moment, when we are close to the historic horizon, the verb + prefix begins to settle out into fixed forms in which certain prefixes occur predominantly with intransitive, others with transitive senses, and so on, while within each of them there takes place a split into two, three, or four forms largely correlated with conceptions of time, hitherto entirely wanting, except possibly in the perfect.

<sup>1</sup> See § 28 *sup.*, and, for Mikir *in-*, § 161 *inf.*

## B. HISTORIC TIBETAN

At this point we reach historic time, and find the roots when functioning in verbal capacity still carrying the old prefixes and showing still distinct correlation with neuter, intransitive, transitive, etc., senses, due to their having for so long been called upon in the early language to accompany the root when projected into these several meanings.

In addition to this there is the four-fold split in accordance with the so-called "Present, Perfect, Future, and Imperative".

The whole may be tabulated somewhat as follows (taking the substantive-verb type as representative):—

## A. PROTO-TIBETAN

R				
Substantive	Verb			
	Neuter	Active Intransitive	Active Transitive	"Causative"
R	m-R			
			<i>b</i> -R <sup>1</sup>	
			<i>br</i> -R	
			<i>bl</i> -R	
			<i>bs</i> -R	
			<i>bd</i> -R ?	
			<i>bg</i> -R ?	

## B. LATER TIBETAN (prior to seventh century)

R				
Substantive	Verb			
	Neuter	Act. Intrans.	Act. Trans.	"Caus."
R				
<i>m</i> -R (§ 26)	<i>m</i> -R (§ 27)			
<i>q</i> -R (§ 29)	<i>q</i> -R (§ 33)	<i>a</i> -R	<i>a</i> -R	
		<i>b</i> -R	<i>b</i> -R	( <i>b</i> -R)
		<i>br</i> -R	<i>br</i> -R	( <i>br</i> -R)
		<i>bl</i> -R	<i>bl</i> -R	
		<i>bs</i> -R	<i>bs</i> -R	<i>bs</i> -R
		<i>bd</i> -R ?	<i>bd</i> -R ?	( <i>bd</i> -R ?)
		<i>bg</i> -R ?	<i>bg</i> -R ?	( <i>bg</i> -R ?)

At this stage each column splits into two, three, or four "tense" forms (§§ 13-20), and immediately afterwards the written language appears.

<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to apportion these exactly. The writer has suggested all he is yet able in §§ 29-46.

The following case of a substantive-verb type will serve as an example.

We will first take the later forms as they are now known to us.

R = <i>gal, gol, kol, kol.</i>				
Substantive	Verb			
	Neuter	Act. Intrans.	Act. Trans.	"Caus."
<i>gal</i> constraint, compulsion.				
<i>mgal</i> jaw, jawbone.	<i>agal-ba</i> to be in opposition.		<i>agal-ba</i> to transgress, to counteract. <i>rgol-ba</i> P., F. <i>brgol</i> to combat, to fight.	
<i>kol(-po, -mo)</i> servant.			<i>akol-ba</i> P. <i>bkol</i> , Imp. <i>kol</i> to force into one's service.	

Originally this probably stood somewhat as follows :—

PROTO-TIBETAN				
R = <i>gal, gol, kol, kol.</i> <sup>1</sup>				
Substantive	Verb			
	Neuter	Act. Intrans.	Act. Trans.	"Caus."
<i>gal</i> constraint, compulsion.				
	<i>m-gal(-ba)</i> being in opposition		<i>*ba-gal(-ba)</i> to oppose, to counteract. <i>br-gol(-ba)</i> to combat, to fight against.	
<i>kol</i> servant.			<i>*ba-kol(-ba)</i> to force into service.	

<sup>1</sup> No account is taken here of any possible priority of surd, sonant, or aspirate.

Again, with the adjective-verb type, we have now, e.g. :—

R = <i>grañ</i> , <i>krañ</i> , <i>krañ</i>			
Adjective	Verb		
	Neuter	Act. Intrans.	Act. Trans.     "Caus."
<i>krañ</i> , <i>kra-ba</i> hard, solid, compact.			
<i>mkran(-ba)</i> hard, solid, compact.			
	<i>agrañ-ba</i> to satisfy, to satiate, to stuff (with food).		
	<i>skrañ-ba</i> P. <i>bskrañs</i> to swell.		

While originally the position probably was :—

PROTO-TIBETAN			
R = <i>grañ</i> , <i>kran</i> , <i>kran</i> <sup>1</sup>			
Adjective	Verb		
	Neuter	Act. Intrans.	Act. Trans.     "Caus."
<i>krañ</i> hard, solid, compact.			
	<i>m-krañ(-ba)</i> being hard, solid, com- pact.		
		<i>bs-krañ(-ba)</i> to swell (to become hard ?)	
			* <i>bq-grañ(-ba)</i> to satisfy, to stuff.

(b) *Elements Standing after the Root*

1. *Tense Suffixes.*

§ 48. The two inseparable suffixes -s (after final *g*, *ñ*, *b*, and *m*) and -d (formerly used after final *n*, *r*, and *l*), though probably not originally connected with time concepts, appear to represent the only attempt in Tibetan to develop

<sup>1</sup> See above, n. 1 (p. 55).



a temporal index intimately connected with the root, and not having the nature of an auxiliary.

In their position after the root, they agree with the younger languages where the auxiliary is suffixed, but otherwise are in no way comparable.

Kachin probably furnishes us with the only other instance of a similar survival,<sup>1</sup> *-sa* being there attached immediately to the verb root in the Perfect tense singular, but in the plural is separated from it by the plural index (*ma-*) in the form *ma-sa-* (v. §§ 87-8). It is significant that this element should occur in the Perfect tense in Kachin, as there is no split of the verb into different "roots" there.

§ 49. This is in agreement with the almost certainly original non-temporal nature of these suffixes.

It is not improbable that they represent particles of the same order as those of the so-called "terminative" case of the substantive, employed for the purpose of indicating the verbal noun root as being an action or state already reached or arrived at, a kind of locative verbal noun<sup>2</sup> or "locative of accompaniment", in fact.

<sup>1</sup> In view of the almost exclusive employment of the Perfect root in many of the modern Tibetan dialects (e.g. Ladakh, Darjeeling, Lhasa, v. Francke, ZDMG., Bd. 57 (1903), p. 288), there is a chance that in Burmese, final *č* in the written forms retains traces of the suffix *-s* in, for instance, *prač* (spoken *pit*) to throw = T. *dbyug-pa*, P. *dbyugs*; *čač* (sp. *tsit*) to filter = T. *alsug-pa*, P. *tsags*, *btsags*, F. *btsag*, Imp. *tsog*; *kyuč* (sp. *čit*) to love = T. *čags-pa*, but nothing definite can yet be drawn from this, as the change appears to be a purely phonetic one of *g*, *k*, through palatal *č* to *t*, as in T. *gčig*, Arakanese (spoken) *taik*, Bur. (written), *tač* > (col.) *tit* one; T. *sreg-pa* partridge, Arakanese (spoken) *raik*, Bur. (written) *rač* > (col.) *yit* pheasant, and others. Compare also ? T. *ljags* tongue, Chinese 舌 \*d'z'jiät.

<sup>2</sup> The same idea is not uncommon elsewhere, and can also affect the passive. Malayan in this way regularly constructs this voice from active verb roots by prefixing the locative element *di* (s) at, in. The resulting forms are also used adjectivally as Perfects (conditions attained). Thus *di-pūkōl*, to be struck, or struck (fr. *pūkōl* vb. act. to strike); *di-ānkat* to be raised, or raised (fr. *ānkat*, to raise). As a preposition, *di-* is equivalent to the Latin *in* with the ablative, generally without motion, *di-dālam* within, *di-situ* there. Compare with T. *-s* and *-d* the double usage both with a verb to form the passive and as a locative preposition in: *di-dūdōk-kan-ña di-kānan* he caused him to be seated (*di-dūdōk*) at the right (*di-kānan*) (term. in quo). Strangely enough these passives sometimes appear as Imperatives, like the T. Perf. in *-s*. *lāier in di-ānkat* Raise this blind (lit. This blind raised). Compare also, de Hollander, *Handleiding bij de Beoefening der Maleische Taal en Letterkunde*, p. 90 et seq.; Tendeloo, *Maleische Grammatica*, i, 196 (§ 88); ii, 239-40; Winstedt, *Malay Grammar*, pp. 70-1 (1st ed.).

From this basis the verb root with *-s* or *-d* would naturally grow into the idea of a Perfect root.

That *-s* now also appears with the Imperative seems to show that the speaker commanded (with the aid of the emphatic vowel change to *o* in many cases, *v.* § 21) that the action be brought immediately *into* such an accomplished or completed condition, just as with our "bedone", "begone", and similar Imperatives.

The employment of case suffixes to indicate time in the verb is by no means unknown in the Indo-Chinese area, and we probably have here an early example of the same practice which later appeared in the Tai languages. There is still room to question (as these latter show us) whether Tibetan *-s* and *-d* may not rather represent *the place from which motion has started*, like Âhom *kâ* perhaps did.<sup>1</sup> But though this would put *-s* in accord with instrumental *-s*, which may have arisen from an old *source whence*<sup>2</sup> idea, it leaves *-d* without a connection, unless it was a mere sound variant, which is possible.

As a consequence of their coming to indicate action as completed, *-s* and *-d* caused many derivatives to settle out from verbs in later times, crystallized into adjectival and substantival meanings.<sup>3</sup>

These derivatives from the so-called "Perfect roots" may be taken under three heads, according as they: —

(1) End in *-s*, which may represent either the Perfect tense suffix *-s* of a verb root ending in a vowel, or a replacement for an original *-ds* or *-nd* by loss of the true root final *-d* or *-n*.

(2) End in *-d*, which may be either the suffix *-d* of the Perfect of a verb root ending in a vowel, or a replacement for an original *-nd*.

(3) End in *-n*, which is the actual root final, probably preserved through the protecting influence of a former suffixed *-d*.

The following, which are not exhaustive lists, are representative of these classes.

<sup>1</sup> Grierson, ZDMG., Bd. 56 (1902), p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> As an index of "source whence" among the case suffixes, marking a point in place or time whence an action starts, *-s* stands out quite strongly. It is of this nature in the instrumental suffixes (built upon the genitive) and expresses "source whence" again in the ablative (built upon the locative).

<sup>3</sup> Which of these two meanings a derivative takes is naturally conditioned by the nature of the archaic root. The substantive-verb type will naturally result in a substantive, the adjective-verb type in an adjective. See § 47 (pp. 55-6).

(1) *Derivatives from Perfects in -s*

§ 50. From roots originally ending in a vowel we have :—

- blus-ma* subst. ransom (cf. *blud-pa*, § 53), Perfect of *blu-ba*,  
P. *blus* to buy off, to ransom.  
*agrus-pa* subst. zeal, diligence, endeavour, Perfect of *agru-ba*,  
P. *grus* to bestow pains upon.  
*apras-pa* subst. stroke, blow, kick, Perfect of *apra-ba*, P.  
*apras* to kick, to strike with the foot.  
*abos* subst., boil, bump, tumour, swelling, Perfect of *abo-ba*,  
P. *abos*, *bo*, *pio*, F. *dbo* to swell up.  
*ltas* subst. miraculous sign or manifestation, omen, miracle,  
Perfect of *lta-ba*, P. *bltas*, F. *blta*, Imp. *ltos*, *blta* to look  
at, to view. (See *ltad-mo*, § 53.)  
*rtsis* subst. counting, numeration; account; estimation,  
esteem, Perfect of *rtsi-ba*, P. (*b*)*rtsis*, F. *brtsi*, Imp.  
(*b*)*rtsi(s)* to count, to reckon.  
*ris* subst. figure, form, design, Perfect of *abri-ba*, P. *bris* to  
draw, to design, to write.

§ 51. From roots originally ending in -d :—

- krus* subst. bath, washing, ablution, Perfect of *akru-ba*, P.  
*krus*, for older, *akrud-pa*, P. *bkrus* to wash, to bathe.

§ 52. From roots originally ending in -n (see also certain cognates in §§ 54, 55) :—

- zas* subst. food, from the Perf. of *za-ba*, P. *bzas*, *zos*, to eat.  
*adus-pa*, *adu-ba* subst. a coming together, an assembly,  
a gathering, Perf. of *adu-ba*, P. *adus* to come together,  
to assemble.  
*adres-ma* subst. mixture, medley, Perf. of *adre-ba*, P. *adres*  
to be mixed with.  
*dros-pa* adj. heated, grown warm, from Perf. of *adro-ba* to  
be warm.  
*mfos* adj. high, from Perf. of *mto-ba* to be high.  
*gos* subst. garment, dress, clothing, from Perf. of *bgo-ba*,  
P. and Imp. *bgos* to dress, to clothe oneself.  
*tsos* subst. paint, dye, from Perf. of *atsod-pa*, P. *btsos*, F. *btso*,  
Imp. *tsos*, *tsod* to dye.  
*rgas-ka* subst. old age, from Perf. of *rga-ba*, P. *rgas* to be old,  
to be aged.  
*rgyas-pa* adj. extensive, large; copious, plentiful, from Perf.  
of *rgya-ba* to be wide, to be extensive.

*rdzus-ma* subst. something counterfeit, feigned or dissembled, from Perf. of *rdzu-ba*, P. (*b*)*rdzus*, F. *brdzu*, Imp. (*b*)*rdzu(s)* to misrepresent, to delude, to falsify.

(2) *Derivatives from Perfects in -d*

§ 53. From roots originally ending in a vowel :—

*blud-pa* subst. release, ransom (cf. *blus-ma*, § 50), Perf. of *blu-ba*, P. *blus* to buy off, to ransom.

*nud-mo* subst. a sob, Perf. of *nu-ba*, P. *nus* to weep.

*mčid* (resp.) subst. talk, discourse, speech, Perf. of *mči-ba* to say.

*gdud-pa* subst. love, longing, Perf. of *glu-ba* to love.

*aprod-pa* adj. congenial to, agreeing with, suitable, proper, fit ; probably an old Perfect cognate to *bro-ba* to desire, to wish, and *spro-ba* to feel inclination for, to take delight in, to be willing, to wish.

*bčud* subst. moisture, juice, sap, probably an old Perfect cognate to *aču-ba*, P. *bčus*, F. *bču*, Imp. *čus* to ladle or scoop water, to irrigate, to water ; *ču* water, also evidently belongs here.

*ltad-mo* subst. sight, scene, spectacle, Perf. of *lta-ba*, P. *bltas*, F. *blta*, Imp. *ltos*, *blta* to look, to view, to inspect. (See *ltas*, § 50.)

§ 54. From roots ending originally in *-n* (see also certain cognates in §§ 52, 55).

*drod* subst. warmth, heat, Perf. of *adro-ba* to be warm.

*rgad-pa* adj. old, aged, Perf. of *rga-ba*, P. *rgas* to be old, or aged.

*aład-pa* subst. firmness, constancy ; *gtad-pa* subst. hold, steadiness, firmness. Perfects cognate to *brtan-pa*, *brton-pa*, *rton-pa* to place confidence in, to rely upon.

*gud*, subst. loss, probably Perfect cognate to *rku-ba*, P. (*b*)*rkus*, F. *brku*, Imp. *rkus* to steal, to rob. (See, however, § 31, No. 6.)

(3) *Old " Perfects " in -n.*

§ 55. More important for the restitution of the lost root final *-n* in many verbs are substantival and adjectival derivatives of the third class ending in *-n*, where the verb itself ends in a vowel and forms its Perfect in *-s*. The survival of the root final *-n* in this class of derivative is doubtless due

to the protection formerly afforded it in the Perfect roots, from which they arose, by the tense suffix *-d*.<sup>1</sup>

In this way, for instance, \**man* can be deduced as the verb root for "to wound", since *rman-pa* adj. wounded (formerly \**b-r-man-d*) possesses the final now lost from the verb *rma-ba*, P. *rmas* to wound.

The following are some of these forms, to which are added some supporting cognates from related languages, in which, however, final *-n* frequently passes into *-ñ* or *-m*.

*rkun-ma* subst. thief, theft.

*rku-ba*, P. (*b*)*rkus*, F. *brku*, Imp. *rkus*, to steal, to rob.

With final *-n*, *gun* loss, probably belongs here.

*gčin-ma* subst. urine.

*gči-ba* (or *gčid-pa*), P. *gčis*, F. *gči*, Imp. *gčis* to make water.

Compare, with final *-t*, K. *ḡit* urine (from *ḡi*, *či* to urinate).

*ḡdren-ma* subst. mixture.

*ḡdre-ba*, P. *ḡdres*, Imp. *ḡdres* to be mixed with.

*ḡfun*, *fun* subst. collector, gatherer.

*ḡfu-ba*, *ḡfun-pa*, P. *ḡfus*, *btus*, F. *btu*, Imp. *fus*, *btu*, to collect, to gather.

For the final compare Âo *â-ten* to assemble, to gather, to collect (v. § 139).

*ḡdun-ma* subst. council, association, meeting, society.

*ḡdun-ma* subst. the state of being a bride, a bride, *i.e.* the one who (fem. *-ma*) is united.

*mḡdun* subst. the fore-part, the front side of a thing (with which one first meets or comes in contact).

*mḡdun-ma* subst. wife (*i.e.* one associated).

<sup>1</sup> Here, I believe, we have the origin of the Lepcha practice of "deriving" substantival forms from verbs by means of the "suffixes" *-m*, *-n*, *-t*.

Among these, however, that in *-n* is actually the true verb root with its original final, that in *-m* being called forth by euphony, which largely conditions the finals of this language, while the form in *-t* is a "derivative" in which the old Perfect temporal suffix of the verb (= T. *-d*) has replaced the real final (*-n*), just as *-d* frequently does in Tibetan. The only difference between Lepcha and Tibetan in this matter which I have been able to observe, is one of degree, the former having carried to excess and made a law out of what Tibetan allows only sporadically and then by chance.

The correspondences with Tibetan are naturally in many cases exact, as in: *a-tim* large (*ti* to be great), T. *čen* (*če-ba* to be great); *a-hrum* hot (*hru* to be hot), T. *dron* warm (*dro-ba* to be warm); *a-šum* fat (*šu* to be fat); T. *ṣon* (*ṣo-ba* to be fat); etc.

*adu-ba*, P. *adus* to come together, to assemble, to meet, to unite or join one another (e.g. *k̄yo-šug-tu* as husband and wife), to get married.

*sdud-pa*, *bsdu-ba*, P. *bsdus*, F. *bsdu*, Imp. *sdus*, *bsdu* to collect, to gather, to unite or join (others, e.g. *k̄yo-šug-tu* as husband and wife), to marry.

*dud-pa* to tie, to knit, to knot.

*mdud-pa* subst. knot (*i.e.* a joining together).

For the final compare Lai *tún*, *tôn* to meet.

*dron-mo* adj. warm.

*dro-ba*, P. *dros* to be warm.

For the final compare K. *lum* warm, B. *luñ* to be warm, *l'uñ* to warm oneself at a fire, Âo *lem-lá*, Lh. *lam-á*, M. *ká-rom*, Êmpêo *lúm(-dâ)* warm, Tângkhul N. (*k̄a-*)*lum*, Thâdo *a-lúm*, Siyin *lum*, Maru *lauñ*. Compare also Âhom and Siamese *rân* hot, and Dîm. *lum* (Plains), *lim* (Hills) to be hot, to have a fever. Also agreeing with the CT. spoken form *dhon(-mo)*, Lahûl and Khams *don(-mo)* we have Sikkim T. *tûm-po*, Gârô *dññ-â* (Âwe), *tuñ-â* (Âtong), *dññ-u* (Rugâ), Dîm. and Bâ. *gũ-duñ*, Râbhâ *tuñ-a*.

*mton-po* adj. high.

*mto-ba*, P. *mto*s to be high ; adj. high.

T. has the final again in *adon-pa*, P. *bron*, F. *gdon*, Imp. *ton* to elevate, to raise, *a-ton-pa*, P. and Imp. *ton* to rise, to arise. The final appears also in Lh. *n-tsôn-â* high.

*rman-pa* adj. wounded.

*rma-ba*, P. *rmas* to wound.

*smyon-pa* adj. insane, mad, frantic.

*smyo-ba*, *myo-ba*, P. *smyos*, *myos* to be insane, mad, or frantic.

For the final compare Lh. *ze-ven* (< ? *zwen*, *smen*).

*gson-pa* adj. living, alive.

*gson-pa*, P. *gsos*, (*b*)*sos* to be alive.

*gso-ba* to feed, to nourish, to rear, to bring up.

*tsan* adj. hot, warm.

*tsa-ba* to be hot.

*rgan-pa* adj. old, aged.

*rga-ba*, P. *rgas* to be old or aged.

For the final compare Lh. *e-he<sup>n</sup>* old (of animals or things), Âo *te-â-in* (< (*te-*)*â-yen* or some such form ?), *te-zen* old.

The T. prefix *r-* probably appears independently in Dim. *râ* to be old, which would make the T. word a synonym compound *ra + gan*.

*žun-pa* adj. melted.

*ažu-ba*, P. *bžus*, F. *bzu* to melt.

The final appears again in T. *ažun-pa*, P. *bčun*, F. *gžun* to subdue, to tame, to make soft (B. *čôn* to tame, to subdue), which may be related. K. has *tun* to melt.

*skyin-pa* subst. a thing borrowed, a loan.

*skyi-ba*, P. *bskyis*, F. *bskyi*, Imp. *skyis* to borrow.

*rdzun*, *brdzun* subst. falsehood, fiction, fable, lie.

*rdzu-ba*, P. (b)*rdzus*, F. *brdzu*, Imp. (b)*rdzu(s)* to misrepresent, to delude, to falsify.

*rgyun* subst. flow, current, stream.

*rgyu-ba*, *rgyud-pa*, P. *brgyus*, *brgyud*, F. *brgyu*, Imp.

*rgyud* to pass or wander through, to traverse.

*čen(-po, -mo)* adj. great.

*če-ba*, P. *čes* to be great.

For the final compare Sikkim T. *čem-po*, Lepcha *a-tim*, *tim-bo* (to be large = *tī*), Gârô (Âtong) and Râbhâ *čun-â* large, great, Kachin *ma-den*, Âo *me-ten(-lok)* to expand, to enlarge (v. § 127 (p. 121)).

*skyon* subst. fault, defect, damage, harm.

*skyo-ba* to be weary, tired, or vexed.

*šun-pa* subst. bark, skin, peel, rind.

*šu-ba*, P. (b)*šus*, F. *bšu*, Imp. (b)*šu(s)* to draw off, to strip off, to skin, to peel.

*zan* subst. food, fodder, or (in particular) pap, porridge.

*bzan* subst. food (especially of animals); whence: pasture, pasturage.

*za-ba*, *bza-ba*, P. *zos*, *bzas*, F. *bza*, Imp. *zo*, *zos* to eat.

Tibetan has the final also in *gzan-pa* to eat, to devour, to gnaw.

*rnan-pa* subst. reward, fee, wages; vb. act. to reward, to pay, to recompense.

*rna-ba*, P. *brñas*, F. *brna*, Imp. *rños* to mow, to reap, to harvest, to gather in.

*gon-pa* subst. coat, clothing; vb. act. to put on clothes, to dress oneself.

*bgo-ba*, P. and Imp. *bgos* to put on clothes, to dress oneself.

T. has the final also in *skon-pa*, P. and F. *bskon* to dress, to clothe (another person).

*tson* subst. colour, paint.

*btso-ba* to dye, to colour.

*atsod-pa*, *atsed-pa*, P. *btso*s, F. *btso*, Imp. *tsos*, *tsod* to dye.

*kýon* subst. size, extension, width, area.

*rgya-ba* to be wide, to be extensive.

*śnan*, *śnon* adv. formerly, before, previously, beforehand.

*śna-ba*, P. *śnas* to be first, to come first, to be beforehand.

*mgron(-pa)* (Schr.) adj. strange, foreign.

*agron* subst. alienism, the state of being a foreigner.

*kron-pa* subst. well, spring ("Abfluss").

*agrod-pa*, *sgrod-pa* (rare), to go, to travel.

*bgrod-pa* to go, to walk, to wander.

*skrod-pa*, P. and F. *bskrad* to expel, to drive out, to eject.

*stan* subst. mat, carpet; cushion.

*stad-pa*, P. and F. *bstad*, Imp. *stod* to put on, to lay on.

*bžon-ma* subst. milking cow (lit. the milked one).

*bžo-ba*, *bžos-pa*, *ažo-ba* to milk.

*žo* subst. milk.

*gdan* subst. bolster, seat.

*gda-ba* to be, to be there.

§ 56. Through such derivatives as these, in which the Perfect suffixes of the verb are involved, considerable light is thus thrown upon the apparent interchange of at least some Tibetan finals.

Outside purely phonetic interchanges, these tense elements, and possibly, as will be shown below (§ 57), the terminative and dative suffixes, are, in the writer's opinion, the sources to which we should look for the explanation of varying root finals in Tibetan.<sup>1</sup>

Purely phonetic interchanges may be briefly considered here before coming to interplay of possible directional value.

It is in evidence in, for instance, *akýog-pa*, P. *kyag*, Imp. *kyog* to bring, and *akýon-ba*, P. and Imp. *kýon* id. (WT.), in *adag-pa*, P. *dag* to clear, to wash away, and *dan-ba* to be pure, to be clear, in *rdug-pa*, P. *brdugs*, F. *brdug* to strike

<sup>1</sup> For Laufer's differing views see *Si-Hia*, pp. 110-14, and T'P., xvi (1915), p. 424.



against, and *rduñ-ba*, P. *brduñs*, F. *brduñ*, Imp. (b)*rduñ(s)* to strike, to beat.

Apparently it occurs also in *ñab-pa* to desire, to crave, and *ñam-pa* to desire ardently, to pant for.

The passage in these cases has sometimes been supposed to have been in the direction of sonant to nasal,<sup>1</sup> but the reverse process is known to occur as in WT. *gog* for *goñ-po* lump, cognate to *sgoñ-ba*, P. *bsgoñs*, F. *bsgoñ*, Imp. *sgoñ(s)*, to make round, globular, or into a lump.

Cross changes within the sonant or within the nasal class are generally again of similar origin.

The cross changes between, for instance, *-g*, *-d*, *-b*, and *-ñ*, *-n*, *-m* are probably of purely phonetic origin, a view strongly supported by nearly all related languages, especially such as Burmese and Kachin, and although it is impossible to adduce here all the material bearing upon this point, the following may be taken as typical of the purely phonetic interchanges of Tibetan.<sup>2</sup>

- g <> -d. *atsugs-pa*, *atsud-pa* to enter; *aʃug-pa*, *aʃud-pa*, *aʃud-pa* id.; *rgyug-pa*, *rgyud-pa* to pass; *šeg* (CT.), *šed* strength, force; *ʃog*, *ʃod* that which is uppermost, on, upon.
- g <> -b. *rgyag-pa*, *rgyab-pa* to throw; *gšig-pa*, *gšib-pa* to compare; *aʃig(s)-pa*, *aʃib(s)-pa* to suck up moisture; *ldig-pa*, *ldib-pa* to fall or sink through; *ldeg-pa*, *ldeb-pa* to quake, to shake.
- d <> -b. *gzed-ma*, *gzeb-ma* pannier, cage; *rbad* for *rbab* rolling down.
- ñ <> -n. Within the same verb root.<sup>3</sup> *adren-pa*, P. *drañ(s)*, F. *drañ*, Imp. *dron(s)* to draw, to drag, to pull; *abyin-pa*, P. and Imp. *pyuñ*, F. *dbyuñ* to remove; *adzin-pa*, *zin-pa*, P. (b)*zuñ*, F. *gzuñ*, Imp. *zuñ(s)* to seize; *aʃen-pa*, P. *aʃañs*, F. *aʃañ*, Imp. *ʃoñ*, *ʃañs* to throw, to cast, to fling. Also: *drin*, *drin* kindness, favour; *šnuñ*, *šnun* disease, illness, sickness.
- n <> -m. *aʃen*, *aʃem* aim, goal; *gšin-pa*, *gšim-pa* ground, crushed; *ʃen-pa*, *ʃem-pa* tax, impost.

<sup>1</sup> So by Schiefner, *TS.*, col. 339.

<sup>2</sup> For others, see Schiefner, *TS.*, col. 226.

<sup>3</sup> The change of guttural *-ñ* to dental *-n* is accompanied in such cases by a forward shift of the vowel (*a*, *o*, to *e*; *u* to *i*). Notice, however, *len-pa*, *lon-pa*, *lon-ba*, P. *bloñs*, rarely *loñs*, F. *blañ*, Imp. *loñ(s)*, *blans*, *lon* to obtain.

In short, all finals seem to be affected this way, and even in such interchanges as *skyob-pa*, *skyon-ba* to guard, to save, *skyod-pa*, *skyom-pa* to shake, there does not seem to be evidence of any formative element's having been at work.

## 2. *Non-temporal Suffixes*

§ 57. It is, however, just possible that in some cases the language used more freely the "terminative" suffixes<sup>1</sup> with verb roots to indicate *into* what state, position, or other predicative concept, they passed the direct object.

Verbs of motion would naturally be much affected here, and it may be that in such pairs as *skya-ba*, *skyed-pa* to convey; *agro-ba*, *agrod-pa* (root of both \**gron* as in *agron-pa*?) to go, we have such a usage of *-du*. Also *ak̄yol-ba*, *sk̄yel-ba*, *ak̄yer-ba* to bring, would in this view be formations with the dative *-la* and terminative *-ru* from a root \**k̄yo*, \**k̄ye*, forecast in *ak̄yon-ba*, a weakening from *ak̄yog-pa* to bring; *abyor-ba* to come, a terminative form of a root \**byo(n)* found in *abyon-pa* to come; *rgyud-pa* to traverse, a terminative form of *rgyu-ba* to go, etc. This would corroborate the importance of the consonants in *-du*, *-ru*, *-su* (v. § 34), but the point has yet to be proved.

It is worth noting, however, that should we have here traces of suffixed directives with verbs, we should be in the presence of exactly the same movement of such directives from a position before, to one following the verb, which is so well developed a feature in some of the younger languages of Assam,<sup>2</sup> and, further, that should this be the case, such usages in Tibetan must be regarded as younger than the prefix formations, and as representing a principle which never gained any very great importance in the language, since such forms are comparatively rare.<sup>3</sup> We may, indeed, well suppose that their further development—together with the continued use of the prefix principles themselves in any intelligent manner—was overtaken by the "freezing" of the language which has

<sup>1</sup> As to the significant value of the consonants of these, see p. 39, n. 1, above.

<sup>2</sup> § 98.

<sup>3</sup> There are doubtless still lying unobserved many instances, such as: *ak̄ras-pa* (Schr.) to freeze, to congeal (lit. to pass into (-s) a solid (*ak̄ra-ba*) (state)); *grans-pa* (beside *gran-ba*) to grow cold, to become cold (lit. to pass into (-s) a state of coldness (*gran-ba*), where a third form *bsgran-ba* to chill (to pass into (-s) a state) of coldness (caus.)) appears to show the active sense depending upon the active subject prefix *b-* (see §§ 22, 30), as in the other two forms it is lacking.

given us its old written form so well preserved, with but so little trace for the reason of its being.

That such a transfer of directive function in Tibetan might well be expected to come to light is, indeed, natural enough, for, as we shall see in the sequel, nearly all the important changes represented in the younger languages of Assam and Burma can be traced back to some early corresponding manifestation in Tibetan.

Indeed, alternative forms showing this transfer in some cases seem to occur, as in *bsgag-pa* (rare) possibly older than *agegs-pa* (P. *bkag*, F. *dgag*, Imp. *kog*) to hinder, to prohibit, and *akegs-pa*, P. *kegs* to hinder, to stop, to shut off; *sgrog-pa*, P. *bsgrags*, F. *bsgrag*, Imp. *sgrag(s)* synonymous with *agrogs-pa*, *agrag-pa* to bind, to fasten, to tie together.

Such pairs, however, need further investigation. They may be only parallel forms.

§ 58. It is possible that we have to do with a formation of this nature in those instances in which *-s* or *-d* appear suffixed to Present roots of transitive verbs, the intransitive members of which are without them.

*agebs-pa*, P. *bkab*, F. *dgab*, Imp. *kob* to cover, appears, for instance, against *agab-pa* to hide oneself, and it is possible here that *-s* actually replaces *d-* (as still retained in the Future), since where it occurs, the prefixed directive is absent. This is regularly the case with both *-s* and *-d* in such usages, as will appear from the examples to be given below, and despite identity in form, there can hardly be question of a mis-applied Perfect tense suffix.

Are we to conclude from this that the split in the once unified verb block had already begun when the first transfers of directive functions from prefixed to suffixed positions took place? It appears so. And this is only evidence in line with what has already been suggested: that the suffixation of directive elements was a comparatively late development, occurring at a time when the language was already beginning to give up its old morphological principles, among which the unified verb block with prefixed directive element was so characteristic.

Examples of this occurrence of *-s* are the following:—

*agebs-pa*, P. *bkab*, F. *dgab*, Imp. *kob* to cover; standing opposite *agab-pa* to hide oneself.

*agegs-pa*, P. *bkag*, F. *dgag*, Imp. *kog*, also *akegs-pa*, P. *kegs* to stop, to hinder, to prohibit; opposite *agag-pa*, P. *agags* to be at a standstill.  
*agens-pa*, P. *bkañ*, F. *dgañ*, Imp. *koñ* to fill; opposite *agan-ba* adj. full, plentiful.  
*agug(s)-pa*, P. *bgug*, F. *dgug*, Imp. *kug* to bend; opposite *kug* adj. crooked, bent.  
*abig(s)-pa*, P. *pijs*, F. *dbig*, Imp. *pig(s)*, and *abug(s)-pa*, P. *piug*, F. *dbug*, Imp. *pug* to pierce, to bore; opposite *bug-pa* subst. hole, *pug-pa* subst. cavern.  
*abebs-pa*, P. *piab*, F. *dbab*, Imp. *pob* to throw down; opposite *abab-pa*, P. *bab(s)*, Imp. *abob*, *bobs* to fall down, to go down.

§ 59. In the cases below, *-d* appears in the same way.<sup>1</sup>

*abyed-pa*, P. and Imp. *pye*, *pyed*, *pyes*, F. *dbye* vb. tr. (a) to open, (b) to separate, to keep asunder; opposite *abye-ba*, P. and Imp. *bye* vb. intr. (a) to open, (b) to divide, to separate.  
*abud-pa*, P. *bus*, *pu(s)*, F. *dbu*, Imp. *pu(s)* to blow, to inflate; opposite *abo-ba*, P. *abos*, *bo*, *po*, F. *dbo* to swell up, to rise.  
*agyed-pa*, P. *bgyes*, F. *bkye* to divide, to scatter, to disperse (tr.); opposite *agye-ba*, P. *gyes* to be divided, to disperse (intr.).  
*aded-pa*, P. and Imp. *ded* to drive, to pursue, to chase; opposite *ada-ba*, P. *adas* to pass by or beyond, to travel over.

## THE SUBSTANTIVE

### *Elements Standing before the Root*

§ 60. The Tibetan substantive does not directly concern us here, the prefixes nearly always representing the abraded first component of an old juxtaposed form, on many individual instances of which Laufer<sup>2</sup> has shed so welcome a light.

Only in those substantives which are lapses of verb forms into substantival meanings, do the prefixes appear to be of other origin.

<sup>1</sup> Compare Laufer's contrary view in T'oung Pao, vol. xv (1914), pp. 62-3.

<sup>2</sup> *The Si-Hia Language: A Study in Indo-Chinese Philology* (T'oung Pao, xvii, No. 1, Mars, 1916). See also the same author in T'oung Pao, xv, No. 1 (Mars, 1914), pp. 108-9.

Though this is frequent with all the verbs, it is particularly well in evidence with many weakly constituted *m*- roots as was noticed above in § 26.

As in such cases, the prefix is, of course, not proper to the resulting substantive at all, it only remains to mention here the prefix 'a-, the relatives of which in other languages are traced for Kachin in § 64, for the Bodo and Nâgâ languages in § 103, for the Kuki-Chin group in §§ 185-6, and for Burmese in § 216.

# KACHIN

## PRELIMINARY

### A

§ 61. It is probably safe to assume that at the outset Kachin possessed almost the same morphological equipment in the matter of prefixes as Tibetan, but in later days it has gone ahead and pursued a course of its own, building up a number of new derivatives with no parallels in Tibetan.

*la-gât* to scoop, to shovel, for instance, corresponds to T. *rkod-pa*, *rko-ba* (P. (b)*rkos*, F. *brko*, Imp. *rkos*) to dig, to excavate, to shovel or scoop out earth, but *da-gât* to scoop, to ladle (K'auri), *ša-gât* to scoop up with the hand, and *n-gât* a shallow bamboo basket, are new developments peculiar to Kachin.

§ 62. Among the provincial dialects of Tibetan, Kachin naturally approaches nearest to that of Khams in at least some particulars.

The same feeling for euphony that this dialect has developed, which changes the prefix *a-* of the written language into *n-* before gutturals, *n-* before dentals, palatals, dental sibilants, and (when they become cerebral or palatal) the labials + subscript, *m-* before simple labials (v. § 8, n. 2), has evidently given Kachin some, at least, of its forms in *n-*.

Thus Kachin has *n-dât* to long for, to desire, in agreement with Khams *n-dod-pa*, as against written Tibetan *a-dod-pa*.

§ 63. It is characteristic of Kachin that it has dental initials in many roots where Tibetan has palatals. Thus :—

### K.

*tum.*

*ka-tum.*

*tāk.*

*ka-tāk.*

### T.

*čom-pa* to be finished.

*ačoms-pa*, P. *bčom*, F. *gžom*,  
Imp. *čom* to destroy. (Cf.

M. *tañ* to finish, Dîm.

*čâm* to be finished.)

*ačag-pa*, P. *čags* to be broken.

*gčog-pa*, P. *bčag*, Imp. *čog(s)*  
to break.

K.	T.
<i>ɖut, tɖut.</i>	<i>gčod-pa</i> , P. <i>bčad</i> , F. <i>gčad</i> , Imp. <i>čod</i> to cut, to break, to sever. (Cf. M. <i>tu</i> , Ang. <i>du</i> .)
<i>tun.</i>	<i>aʃu-ba</i> , P. <i>bžus</i> , F. <i>bžu</i> , to melt, to dissolve; <i>žun-pa</i> melted.
<i>tuk, ʃa-tuk.</i>	<i>aʃog-pa</i> , P. <i>bžag</i> , F. <i>gžag</i> , Imp. <i>žog</i> to adjust, to arrange, to put in order.
<i>tun, ʃa-tun.</i>	<i>aʃum-pa</i> , P. <i>bčum</i> , F. <i>gžum</i> , Imp. <i>čum</i> to shrink, to contract, to draw in; <i>ačum(s)-pa</i> to shrink.
<i>n-dat.</i>	<i>čad-pa</i> to promise, to pledge.

On the other hand, some of the most characteristic palatalizations of Tibetan, occasioned by *ya-tag*, also appear in Kachin, as in the following instances:—

K.	T.
<i>čã</i> to be joined, to fit.	<i>žor-la</i> joined (for <i>sbyor-la</i> ); <i>abyor-ba</i> , <i>aɓyar-ba</i> , to be joined, to stick, to adhere to > WT. <i>ʃar</i> .
<i>ʃa-čã</i> to make fit, to adjust.	<i>sbyor-ba</i> , P. and F. <i>sɓyar</i> to affix, to fasten, to join > WT. <i>žar</i> .

## B

§ 64. In Kachin *a*-,<sup>1</sup> which occurs with adjectives and substantives derived from verbs, as well as with true substantives, we probably have a direct connection with Tibetan 'a-, the oldest and original usage of which appears to have been before substantives indicating family relationships. With these in Kachin, *a*- likewise occurs. Thus we have, e.g. *nu* or *a-nu* mother, *na* or *a-na* elder sister, *woi* or *a-woi* grandmother, but when used in third personal connection, *a*- gives place to the known third personal prefix *ka*-. In this

<sup>1</sup> For the distinction between this prefix and that of similar form (*a*-) allied to Tibetan *a*-, *b*- of the active verb, see §§ 77-9, 185-6, 216, and for the possibility of there being many directly lapsed verb forms in *a*- here, see § 79.

way *wa* or *a-wa* is “father”, but “his father” is *ši-a ka-wa*. Clearly *a-* does not function as a third personal link prefix here.

If this is the origin of Kachin *a-*, correspondences with Lepcha *a-*, which represents an extension of the mechanical prefix usage found in Tibetan as *'a-*, are true equivalences. They occur, for instance, in :—

K.	L.
<i>a-teñ</i> adv. truly, really (fr. <i>teñ</i> to be true).	<i>a-lāñ</i> adv. truly, really, adj. true, right, subst. truth (fr. <i>lāñ</i> to be true).
<i>a-teñ</i> adj. spotted (fr. <i>teñ</i> to be spotted).	<i>a-dón</i> adj. variegated, black and white (fr. <i>dón</i> to be variegated, or black and white).
<i>a-tsām</i> adj. beautiful, elegant (fr. <i>tsām</i> to be beautiful).	<i>a-tsum</i> adj. beautiful, subst. beauty.
<i>a-fat</i> adj. thick (fr. <i>fat</i> to be thick).	<i>a-fet</i> adj. thick (as soup).
<i>a-čan</i> adj. black, dark (fr. <i>čan</i> to be black).	<i>a-tyañ</i> adj. black (of pigs) (fr. <i>tyañ</i> to be black).

§ 65. This non-pronominal *a-* of Kachin has in this way invaded the domain occupied in the Kuki-Chin area by the quite distinct pronominal element *a-* of Series II (v. § 185).

Correspondences consequently occur between them, as, for instance, in :—

Kachin	Thâdo
<i>a-ka</i> bitter, sour.	<i>a-kâ.</i>
<i>a-čoi</i> beautiful, pretty.	<i>a-hoi.</i>
<i>a-pa</i> flat, level.	<i>a-pai.</i>
<i>a-pá</i> thin.	<i>a-pá.</i>
<i>a-san</i> clean.	<i>a-teñ.</i>
<i>a-sin</i> black.	<i>a-yiñ.</i>
<i>a-tun</i> fat.	<i>a-tou.</i>

With the unrelated vocalic element of the same series in the Assam area the same type of correspondence occurs, as in :—

Kachin	Mikir
<i>a-pu</i> bud, flower, blossom.	<i>â-pû.</i>
<i>a-foi</i> light (subst.),	<i>â-tur</i> light (subst.).
<i>a-tu</i> bright, shining (adj.).	



Elements of Series I also naturally correspond in function before the same root in many cases, as, for instance, Mikir *ke-* :—

Kachin	Mikir
<i>a-mai</i> good.	<i>ke-mê</i> .
<i>a-si</i> death.	<i>ke-ti</i> .
<i>a-šan</i> beginning, forefront.	<i>ke-čen</i> .
<i>a-tsu</i> pain, suffering.	<i>ke-so</i>

### C

§ 66. Quite distinct from the prefix in § 83 is another element *ka-*, *ga-*, of evident pronominal origin, by means of which many adjectival derivatives have been formed from verb roots.

It appears again with substantives, and is the same element which is so frequent in the Bodo and Nâgâ groups, and is traceable in origin to an old third personal (originally demonstrative) pronoun (= T. *ko*, v. §§ 96, 107) which has now disappeared from independent use except in the dual *ka-n* (< *kā-ni*) they (two).

Examples of direct correspondence with Bodo forms are :—

Kachin.	Dîmâ-sâ.	Bârâ.	
<i>ga-lu</i>	<i>ga-láo</i>	<i>ga-lau</i>	long.
<i>ga-dun</i> , <i>ka-dun</i>		<i>gũ-sún</i>	short.
<i>ga-dân</i> , <i>ka-dân</i>	<i>gõ-soñ</i>		steep.
<i>ka-tsin</i>	<i>ga-tân</i>	<i>ga-tân</i>	unripe, green.
<i>ka-ja</i>		<i>ga-hâm</i>	good.
<i>ka-ji</i> (small, unimportant, trivial)		<i>ga-hai</i>	short, small.
<i>ka-si</i> , <i>ka-tsi</i>	<i>ga-sain</i>	<i>ga-zân</i>	cold.
<i>ka-šun</i> (to be cold)			

### THE VERB

#### *Preliminary*

§ 67. Before taking in detail the morphological elements associated with the Kachin verb, the following differences between Kachin and Tibetan should be noted.

(1) There is no separable pronominal element in Kachin which allows the insertion of directive particles between itself and the main verb root. *ba-*, *pa-*, *pa-* (the separable Tibetan *b-*) is here always inseparable.

This seems to have been forecast in Tibetan, where *b-* is often used alone where we should expect it to be followed by a directive infix,<sup>1</sup> a usage evidently due to the strongly active subject which *b-* indicates naturally carrying with it, almost as a part of itself, the associated idea of direction towards the object, the necessity for expressing which, when *b-* is used, consequently not being felt.

(2) The directives now always stand alone, and do not, as in Tibetan, allow any pronominal element before them. This development was definitely forecast by Tibetan.

(3) Probably in compensation for the two developments just mentioned, elements are introduced in Kachin between the main verb root and its auxiliary. Some of these are clearly prefixes to the auxiliary, others apparently suffixes to the main root. The latter of these developments is also probably traceable to a beginning in Tibetan (v. §§ 57, 58).

§ 68. One of the most important points in which Kachin divides itself from Tibetan is in the eventual destiny of the verb forms with the old pronominal (demonstrative) prefixes of the subject, *ma-* (T. *m-*) and *ba-*, *pa-*, *pa-* (T. *b-*). Kachin is the only language known to me, in which these elements sink into pure link<sup>2</sup> prefixes, forming from the verb, adjectival derivatives in precisely the same manner as do the later elements (*ka-*, *ga-*, *te-*, etc.), of the Bodo and Nâgâ groups (v. § 99). Should any doubt remain as to the pronominal or demonstrative nature of these prefixes (*m-* and *b-*) their behaviour in Kachin, which is exactly that of such later elements of known demonstrative origin, should dispel it.

This development in Kachin is probably the result of two interrelated causes: (1) the potentially genitive nature of the subject elements *ma-*, *ba-*, *pa-*, *pa-*, in the so frequently intransitive verbs employing them, and (2) the lack in Kachin of a relative suffix construction for descriptive (adjectival)

<sup>1</sup> v. § 30, where a list of Tibetan roots in *b-* alternating with *br-*, *bs-*, (*b*)*d-*, (*b*)*g-*, forms is given.

<sup>2</sup> Tibetan forms such as *mdzes-pa* beautiful, *mdzans-pa* wise, are not of this nature. The weak verb form has sunk as a whole into an adjective (v. § 26). The prefix is not a link prefix, at least consciously. The relative suffix *-pa* plays an important part here (see again below).

expressions represented in Tibetan by *-ma*, *-ba*, *-pa* (and the gender series *-mo*, *-bo*, *-po*, *po*).

In the ancient language, for instance, Kachin *gwi ma-na* a mad dog, could have meant only "the dog is mad" (lit. it (*ma-*) is mad, or its (*ma-*) being mad; *na* a pure verbal noun), but the potentially genitive *ma-* has allowed the verb formed with it to become purely adjectival in function, lit. its (*ma-*) being mad (see again below, § 99, n. 1). In the same manner *ma-čan* really "it is black" or "its being black" is now an adjective "black", *ma-ńap* really "it is soft" or "its being soft" now simply "soft", and many others. That many *ma-* derivatives should take a substantival turn is nothing surprising, but is dependent largely upon the meaning of the bare root devoid of prefix. So, e.g. from *pyen* to fly we have *ma-pyen* wings (lit. their flying), from *rut* to rub, *ma-rut* a grater (lit. its rubbing), and many others.

The Tibetan relative suffix construction was probably largely responsible for preventing so great a development in this direction in Tibetan as in Kachin. "A mad dog" in Tibetan is *Kyi smyon-pa*, lit. a dog, one which (*-pa*) is mad; "black" is *nag-pa*, *nag-po*, lit. the one which (*-pa*) is black; "soft" is *ańam-pa* or *mńen-pa* lit. the one which (*-pa*) is soft.<sup>1</sup> The lack of this usage in Kachin has probably largely contributed to the so frequent transformation of the old subject prefixes (*m-* and *b-*) into pure link elements now marking the verbal noun root when in descriptive juxtaposition with a substantive as a descriptive adjunct relating to it.

This process, however, has not operated universally to the total exclusion of the original verb forms in *ma-*, many of which, indeed, still remain in Kachin which are lost from Tibetan. So it happens that, for instance, Kachin *ma-tā* is "to spit, to expectorate" in its old active intransitive form. This does not now appear in Tibetan, where we find only the root *to*, *tu* spittle, in *to-le adebs-pa* (WT. *tu gyab-če*) to spit. Again Kachin *ma-ka* is an active intransitive verb form "to open, to gape (as with the mouth)", a form which Tibetan does not possess, having only the root *ka* an opening, a mouth.

<sup>1</sup> Actually "being soft that one (*a-*, *m-*) which (*-pa*) is". See § 106.

(a) *Elements Standing before the Main Verb Root*(1) *The Pronominal or Subjective Prefixes**ma-*

§ 69. The Kachin verb forms in *ma-* which normally constitute a class of intransitives descriptive of unchanging conditions,<sup>1</sup> or, at most, describe an act on the part of the subject which does not entail any motion on the part of the subject, or any movement or change on the part of the object in consequence of the verbal action, naturally show the same tendency as the *m-* verbs of Tibetan.

These latter, as we have seen in § 26, tend to pass into substantival and adjectival senses, and the same happens even more regularly in Kachin.<sup>2</sup> Here the plain verb root generally retains its old verbal form, but the forms in *ma-* have become either substantival or adjectival. So, while *tsun* is “to speak” (intr.) *ma-tsun* is “a word, a command”; *rum* to centre around, to have a common source, *ma-rum* centre, origin, source; *Kyeñ* to be red, *ma-Kyeñ* adj. red; *mut* to be blue, *ma-mut* adj. bluish, dark; *prã* to be white, *ma-prã* adj. white, and many others.

The potentially genitive nature of the subject of this class of verb evidently aided this development, and places these *ma-* derivatives in the same class as those in *ka-*, *ga-* here (v. § 66), and in the Bodo and Nâgâ groups. *ma-tsun* is “his speaking, his speech”, i.e. “a word, a command”; *ma-mut* “its being blue”, whence adjectivally “blue” (see again § 68).

The original and normal type of *ma-* verb is still found in e.g. :—

*ma-nam* to smell (intr.).                      *ma-ni* to laugh.

*ma-den* to grow, to expand, to  
spread (intr.).

etc.

<sup>1</sup> § 26.

<sup>2</sup> Though the meanings of these lapsed forms sometimes vary, there can be no doubt that they are the result of the same process. Thus while in Tibetan we have *mkan* now used only as a substantive denoting “one who knows a thing thoroughly, making a trade or profession of it”, Kachin has what is evidently the same form in *ma-kan*, *ma-gan*, but with a differing meaning: “work”. Both appear to have originally descended from an old root *kan* to work at, to make a business or profession of, which has now dropped out of both languages. From the same root Tibetan also has *mkas* skilled, learned, a direct application of the Perfect in *-s* after the loss of the root final *-n* (v. § 52).

§ 70. Correspondence of Kachin *ma-* with (a) Tibetan *m-* before the same root is rather rare, and seems limited to basic words common to many related languages. Thus :—

K.	T.
<i>ma-nam</i> to smell (intr.).	<i>mnam-pa</i> .
<i>ma-ni</i> to be soft.	<i>mñen-pa</i> .

§ 71. Cross correspondences to Tibetan *b-*, *q-*, seem more common, and occur in the following instances :—

K.	T.
<i>ma-du</i> to possess, to have.	<i>bdog-pa</i> id.
<i>ma-kan</i> to press, to push, to exert oneself.	<i>bkan-pa</i> to press, to push, to apply (one's foot or hand) against.
<i>ma-kâp</i> to cover, to shield, to defend (also <i>ma-nâp</i> ).	<i>akeb-pa</i> , P. <i>kēbs</i> to cover, to spread over. (Cf. also <i>agebs-pa</i> , P. <i>bkaḅ</i> , F. <i>dgab</i> , Imp. <i>kob</i> to cover, to protect.)
<i>ma-kyit</i> to tie, to make a knot.	<i>akyig-pa</i> , P. <i>bkyigs</i> , F. <i>bkyig</i> to bind, to tie up.
<i>ma-rel</i> to scratch (as a thorn). (Cf. <i>rat</i> to scratch, to wound, to lacerate.)	<i>abrad-pa</i> (properly <i>b-rad-pa</i> ?), <i>adrad-pa</i> , P. <i>brad</i> , Imp. <i>brod</i> to scratch, to wound, to lacerate. (Cf. also <i>bgrad-pa</i> to scratch.)
<i>ma-tsuñ</i> to be plentiful.	<i>adzom-pa</i> id.
<i>ma-zin</i> to keep, to guard.	<i>ačaiñ-ba</i> , P. <i>bčaiñs</i> , F. <i>bčaiñ</i> , Imp. <i>čon(s)</i> id.
<i>ma-dân</i> , <i>ma-tân</i> to throw up, to vomit.	<i>a-ton-pa</i> , P. and Imp. <i>ton</i> to come out, to issue. <i>adon-pa</i> , P. <i>btôn</i> , F. <i>gdon</i> (acc. Cs.), Imp. <i>ton</i> to expel, to turn out, to eject.

§ 72. Again the agreement of *ma-* with (b) Nâgâ forms, is comparatively rare and seems limited to words which might well belong to old common Tibeto-Burman stock.

Thus with *Âo me-*, *Lhôtâ m-*, *n-*, there occur :—

K.	Âo
<i>ma-den</i> to widen, to extend, to enlarge.	<i>me-ten</i> (- <i>lok</i> ) to enlarge.
<i>ma-ŋi</i> to bud.	<i>me-či</i> to bud.
<i>ma-nam</i> to smell.	<i>me-nem</i> to smell.
<i>ma-ni</i> , <i>ma-nit</i> to laugh.	<i>me-na</i> to laugh.
<i>ma-ya</i> to chew.	<i>me-ŋāk</i> to chew.
<i>ma-zum</i> to be closely associated with.	<i>me-dem</i> , <i>me-tem</i> to associate.
<i>ma-di</i> to be moist, damp, or wet.	<i>me-ten</i> to moisten. ( <i>te-me-ten</i> adj. moist.)
<i>ma-dit</i> to moisten ; adj. wet. }	
<i>ma-ŋā</i> to gather together and tie up (as the four corners of a sheet).	<i>me-sa</i> to tie.

K.	Lh.
<i>ma-gā</i> to be bent, to be crooked.	<i>n-ku</i> (- <i>tet</i> ) to bend.

Cross correspondences to *Âo á-* occur in :—

K.	Âo
<i>ma-wai</i> to rescue, to save.	<i>á-wā-tsa</i> to save.
<i>ma-tep</i> to fasten, to secure, to squeeze, to pinch.	<i>á-tep</i> (- <i>lok</i> ) id. (Cf. ( <i>Âo</i> ) <i>me-ŋep</i> to pinch, <i>á-ŋeb</i> to squeeze.)
<i>ma-ri</i> to buy, to purchase.	<i>á-li</i> .
<i>ma-gān</i> to collect, to heap, to gather up.	<i>á-kam</i> (- <i>ok</i> ) to collect.
<i>ma-kān</i> to gather, to collect, to hoard, to accumulate. }	
<i>ma-ŋan</i> to gather, to sweep together.	<i>á-ten</i> to gather.
<i>ma-yañ</i> to bury.	<i>á-rem</i> .
<i>ma-yoi</i> to sharpen.	<i>á-ei</i> .

In some cases where *ma-* occurs before an adjectival or substantival form, and a *Nāgā* language has an element of a newer series, as, for instance :—

K. <i>ma-ñap</i> adj. soft (fr. <i>ñap</i> to be soft).	Âo. <i>te-á-nab</i> adj. soft (fr. <i>á-nab</i> to be soft).
--	---

the Kachin verb form in *ma-* has lapsed directly into an adjectival sense, while *Âo* employs a new element (of Series I) to accomplish the same end.

*n-*

§ 73. In the prefix *n-*, Kachin appears to have a phonetic variant of *ma-*, corresponding in phonetic form to negative *n-* beside *m-*, and the Lhôtâ subjective (pronominal) prefix *n-*, as a variant of *m-*.

Kachin *n-* occurs by far the most frequently with substantives and adjectives which may once have been verb forms (*v.* § 68 *sup.*), and aligns itself in this particular, distinctly with the pronominal elements.

Correspondence with Khams *n-* (K. *n-dât* to long for, to desire, Kh. *n-dod-pa*) though interesting, does not appear to throw light upon the origin of the Kachin prefix, as in Khams, *n-* is a variant of *a-* before palatals, dentals, and dental sibilants (*n-dod-pa* thus for *adod-pa*), a limitation not imposed upon Kachin *n-*.

The following correspondences may be noted :—

§ 74. (1) With Tibetan *m-*.

K.	T.
<i>n-ja</i> to love.	<i>mdza-ba</i> .

§ 75. (2) With Tibetan *b-*, *a-*.

K.	T.
<i>n-dât</i> to long for, to desire.	<i>adod-pa</i> .
<i>n-gum</i> to bend forward, to be flat on the face.	<i>agum-pa</i> , P. <i>bkum</i> , F. <i>dkum</i> , Imp. <i>kum(s)</i> to bend, to curve, to make crooked.
<i>n-prat</i> to scratch.	<i>abrad-pa</i> , P. <i>brad</i> , Imp. <i>brod</i> .

§ 76. (3) With *Âo* Nâgâ *me-*, *ma-*.

K.	Âo
<i>n-kup</i> to turn, to fold over (as the edge of a blade).	<i>ma-kap</i> to turn over.

(4) With *Âo* Nâgâ *â-*.

K.	Âo
<i>n-tân</i> to cut, to sever.	<i>â-ten</i> to cut up.

(5) With Lhôtâ *m-*, *n-*.

K.	Lh.
<i>n-tsen</i> to suspect, to think.	<i>n-čam</i> to think.

(6) With Mikir *in-*.

K.	M.
<i>n-gum</i> , <i>n-nium</i> to bend forward, to be flat on the face.	<i>in-hum</i> to bend.
<i>n-tān</i> to cut, to sever.	<i>in-t'an</i> to cut up.
<i>n-pā</i> to begin, to start, to "open" proceedings. ( <i>pā</i> (Āo <i>ā-puñ</i> ) to open, to blossom.)	<i>in-pu</i> to open.

*a-*

§ 77. Kachin has a parallel form of the prefix *ba-*, *pa-*, *pā-*, i.e. *a-*, which occurs before a certain number of active verbs, and corresponds in this way, directly to Tibetan *a-*, the relative of Tibetan *b-* (v. § 29).

In these cases Kachin *a-* is entirely distinct from the prefix of similar form considered in §§ 64-5.

§ 78. Direct correspondences with Tibetan *a-*, *b-*, are found in :—

K.	T.
<i>a-dep</i> to rap, to hit.	<i>adebs-pa</i> , P. <i>btap</i> , F. <i>gtab</i> , Imp. <i>lob</i> to strike, to hit.
<i>a-ŋep</i> to clap together (as the hands).	<i>aŋebs-pa</i> , P. <i>ŋebs</i> to hit, to strike ; to be hit or struck (WT.).
<i>a-dip</i> to compel, to coerce.	<i>aŋab-pa</i> to combat, to fight, to contend against.
<i>a-tāk</i> to cut, to sever, to chop.	<i>aŋsog-pa</i> , P. <i>btsags</i> , F. <i>btsag</i> , Imp. <i>tsog</i> to hew, to chop, to cut.
<i>a-gret</i> to scratch (as a thorn), to graze (as a bullet).	<i>bgrad-pa</i> to scratch.
<i>a-pāt</i> to blow.	<i>abrad-pa</i> , <i>adrad-pa</i> , P. <i>brad</i> , Imp. <i>brod</i> to scratch.
<i>a-pūk</i> to pat, to tap.	<i>abud-pa</i> , P. <i>bus</i> , <i>pū(s)</i> , F. <i>dbu</i> , Imp. <i>pū(s)</i> id.
<i>a-gru</i> to cry, to howl.	<i>abyug-pa</i> , P. and Imp. <i>byugs</i> id.
	<i>agrog-s-pa</i> , also <i>agrag-s-pa</i> , P. <i>grags</i> to cry, to shout.



K.	T.
<i>a-pyân</i> to rove, to ramble, to wander.	<i>ap̄yo-ba</i> id.
<i>a-gat</i> to scatter.	<i>bgod-pa</i> , P. and Imp. <i>bgos</i> , F. <i>bgo</i> to divide, to dis- tribute, to apportion.
	<i>agyed-pa</i> ( <i>aged-pa</i> Cs.), P. <i>bgyes</i> , F. <i>bkye</i> to divide, to scatter, to disperse.

Being an active transitive prefix, it naturally corresponds sometimes to Tibetan cognates with directive elements, as in, e.g. :—

K.	T.
<i>a-pâm</i> to heap up, to pile up.	<i>spun̄-ba</i> , P. and Imp. <i>spuns</i> id
<i>a-zat</i> to chop, to mince, to cut up.	<i>gčod-pa</i> , P. <i>bčad</i> , F. <i>gčad</i> , Imp. <i>čod</i> to cut off, to chop off.

§ 79. Direct correspondences to *Âo a*<sup>1</sup> occur in the following :—

K.	Âo
<i>a-dep</i> to rap, to hit, to strike. Cf. also <i>a-čep</i> to hit or clap together (as the hands).	<i>â-tep</i> id.
<i>a-tâk</i> to sever, to cut.	<i>â-tâk</i> (- <i>zak</i> ) id.
<i>a-čâk</i> to strike or hit lightly, to touch.	<i>â-tsak</i> to hit, to strike.
<i>a-lem</i> to munch, to chew.	<i>â-len</i> (- <i>sâ</i> ) to chew.
<i>a-nin</i> to press.	<i>â-nen</i> id.
<i>a-nut</i> to rub.	<i>â-net</i> (- <i>ši</i> ) id.
<i>a-šai</i> to divide, to distribute, to apportion.	<i>â-tsa</i> id.
<i>a-waŋ</i> to cut up into sections.	<i>â-wâ</i> to cut.
<i>a-zi</i> to gaze, to stare at.	<i>â-ži</i> to look at.

To Lhôtâ *e*<sup>2</sup> it corresponds directly in :—

K.	Lh.
<i>a-kâk</i> to rap, to hit, to knock.	<i>e-kôk</i> (- <i>kâ-tâ</i> -) <sup>3</sup> id.

<sup>1</sup> For this prefix as the representative of T. *a*-, *b*-(*< \*ba-*) v. § 139.

<sup>2</sup> The same prefix as *Âo â*-, v. § 150.

<sup>3</sup> v. § 152, n. 1, Witter (*Gr.* 118) writes *ekhōkātālā*.

Many of the substantives and adjectives of Kachin in *a-* probably represent direct lapses of *a-* verbs into these senses, just as occurs in the case of *ma-*, *ba-*, *pa-*, *pa-*, and possibly Lhôtâ *e-* (§ 151 *q.v.*). They are not readily distinguishable now, however, from the forms in non-pronominal *a-* (§§ 64, 65), with which they have naturally merged.

*ba-*, *pa-*, *pa-*

§ 80. Forms with this prefix have very frequently suffered the same change into secondary substantival and adjectival meanings as those in *ma-*, a contributing reason for which is probably the basically genitive nature of the subject element, which has thus sunk to the status of a link prefix.

In this way we have, for instance, *nep* to spread (as a mat or mattress), but *pa-nep* subst. mat, mattress; *reñ* to command, but *pa-reñ* subst. overseer, one in command or authority; *ḡau* to serve, but *pa-ḡau* subst. steward, waiter; *ân* to lead, but *pa-ân* subst. leader.

The original active form with this prefix, representing the original type, still frequently survives, as in :—

*pa-ran* to separate.

*ba-le*, *pa-le* to turn over.

*pa-rap* to flutter (as a bird).

etc.

This prefix does not appear to have any direct correspondences before the same root with Tibetan, and its forms are comparatively few.

## (2) Objective or Directive Prefixes

§ 81. The directive elements *da-*, *ta-*, *ṭa-*; *ga-*; *ka-*; *kā-*; *ša-*, *ḡa-*, *ča-*, *sa-*, have fuller forms in which they assume *-ñ*, *-n*, or *-m*, as follows :—

Simple.	With <i>-ñ</i> .	With <i>-n</i> .	With <i>-m</i> .
<i>da-</i>	<i>din-</i>		<i>dum-</i>
<i>ta-</i>	<i>tiñ-</i>		
<i>ṭa-</i>	<i>ṭiñ-</i>		
<i>ga-</i>	<i>gin-</i> (rare)	<i>gin-</i>	<i>gum-</i>
	<i>gun-</i> (not common)		<i>gam-</i> (K'auri)
<i>ka-</i>		<i>kin-</i>	<i>kum-</i>
			<i>kam-</i> (K'auri)
<i>kā-</i>		<i>kīn-</i>	
<i>ša-</i>	<i>šin-</i>		
	<i>šan-</i>		

Simple.	With -n.	With -n.	With -m.
<i>ja-</i>	<i>jin-</i> (not common)		
	<i>jan-</i> (rare)		
<i>ča-</i>	<i>čin-</i>		
<i>sa-</i>	<i>sin-</i>	<i>sin-</i>	<i>sum-</i>
			<i>sam-</i> (K'auri ; rare)

There is evident conflict in the choice of these augments, between a tendency to select them in harmony with the preceding consonant of the prefix on the one hand, and the following initial root consonant on the other, a conflict which renders it impossible to lay down any laws for their use.

It seems certain, however, that the fuller forms are not original, but are the result of an attempt to blend with the following root initial, notwithstanding the fact that they are more particularly employed by K'auri and K'ak'u (Northern Kachin) in which word forms are often less abraded than in more southerly Chingpaw, which uses the short forms.

Although for reasons already stated (§ 61) Kachin does not show as many direct correspondences with Tibetan in the matter of prefixes as one might expect, the types of equation existing are exemplified in the following :—

§ 82. Kachin *da-*,<sup>1</sup> Tibetan *d-*

K.

T.

*ḍa-gap* to cover with something wide and flat (fr. *gap* to be covered).

*agebs-pa*, P. *bkab*, F. *dgab*, Imp. *kob* to cover, to spread over.

*da-gup* to cover, to envelop (fr. *gup* to be covered).

*da-gā* to bend over, to fold (as an envelope) (fr. *gā* to be bent, to be crooked).

*dgu-ba* to bend, to make crooked.

§ 83. Kachin *ga-*, *ka-*,<sup>1</sup> Tibetan *g-*

K.

T.

*ga-sat* to fight, to engage in combat (fr. *sat* to kill, to murder).

*gsod-pa*, P. and F. *bsad*, Imp. *sod* to kill, to slay, to murder.

<sup>1</sup> In cases where Kachin forms in *da-* and *ga-*, *ka* appear with substantival senses, and do not fall under the same heading as those in § 66, where the prefix is pronominal, we probably have projections of the verb root by means of the prefix into a condition attained, a development which we have already traced in Tibetan (§ 36 *sup.*).

K.	T.
<i>ka-tum</i> to cut to pieces, to destroy (fr. <i>tum</i> to be ended, to be finished).	<i>aʃoms-pa</i> , P. <i>bčom</i> , F. <i>gžom</i> Imp. <i>čom</i> to finish, to accomplish; to subdue, to conquer, to oppress, to destroy. (Cf. <i>čom-pa</i> to be finished, to be accomplished; <i>čam</i> to have done with.)
<i>ka-tāk</i> to break (fr. <i>tāk</i> to be broken).	<i>gčog-pa</i> , P. <i>bčag</i> , Imp. <i>čog(s)</i> to break, to smash. (Cf. <i>ačag-pa</i> , P. <i>čag(s)</i> to be broken, to be smashed.)
<i>ka-nen</i> to push, to press back (as bushes from one's road).	<i>gnon-pa</i> , <i>non-pa</i> , P. <i>gnan</i> , <i>nnan</i> to press.
<i>ku-nān</i> and its couplet:— <i>ka-nin</i> to push ( <i>nān</i> to push).	
<i>ga-dap</i> to toss, to throw.	<i>aɖebs-pa</i> , P. <i>btab</i> , F. <i>gtab</i> , Imp. <i>tob</i> to cast, to throw.
<i>ka-čān</i> to faint, to swoon.	<i>gčōn-ba</i> to become faint, languid, or exhausted.
<i>ka-čuk</i> to hit against (as in the dark), to come in contact with.	<i>gtug-pa</i> , P. <i>gtugs</i> to reach, to come to, to touch.
<i>ka-sāk</i> , <i>ga-sāk</i> to search, to ransack, to hunt for.	<i>gžig-pa</i> to examine, to search, to try for.

§ 84. Kachin *la-*, Tibetan *-r-* (?)

The status of this prefix is uncertain. It is not the representative of Tibetan *-l-* to which it does not appear to be related.

It is sometimes a phonetic substitute for Tibetan *-r-*,<sup>1</sup> and as such occurs in:—

K.	T.
<i>la-ga</i> to be old.	<i>rga-ba</i> , P. <i>rgas</i> to be old.
<i>la-gu</i> to steal.	<i>rku-ba</i> , P. (b) <i>rkus</i> , F. <i>brku</i> , Imp. <i>rkus</i> to steal.
<i>la-gāt</i> to scoop, to shovel (fr. <i>gāt</i> to be scooped out).	<i>rkod-pa</i> , <i>rko-ba</i> , P. (b) <i>rkos</i> , F. <i>brko</i> , Imp. <i>rkos</i> to dig, to excavate, to make a hole with a shovel or hoe.

<sup>1</sup> The same equivalence also occurs in substantives, as in e.g. *la-gā*, T. *rkañ-pa* foot, *la-kañ* forenum, T. *rkan* (also *dkan*) palate, *la-kap* pincers, snuffers, tongs, T. *cham pa* (also *cham pa*) tongs, pincers.

§ 85. *la-* has the appearance of being in very many cases a late introduction, and is doubtless such in those instances in which the verb in *la-* is evidently so constructed in order to agree with *la-ta* hand, arm, or *la-gâ* foot, leg; a species of rudimentary concordance.

*la-* is probably of this origin in the following representative instances of agreement with *la-ta*, in most of which, indeed, it may be taken as either an instrumental or genitive concordance particle ("with the hand" or "of the hand").

*la-fum* to strike flat-handed.  
*la-tup*, *la-tsup* to close the fist.  
*la-tân*, *la-dân* to stretch out the arm.  
*la-gram* to grope, to fumble about (as in the dark).  
*la-kân* to assist, to lead (as a child or drunk man).  
*la-nân* to hand over, to transmit.  
*la-prâ* to clasp the hands.

*la-tum* to be amputated (arm or leg).  
*la-sîn* to wash the hands.  
*la-mâm* to grope, to feel one's way in the dark.  
*la-gyâ* to be contracted or drawn up (as a paralysed limb).  
*la-kâ* to shift, to remove, to take away.  
*la-noi* to cling or hang on to.

Again with *la-gâ* foot, leg, or *la-kru* hoof, we have the same agreement in :—

*la-gai* to limp, to walk lame.  
*la-kat* to kick (as a horse).  
*la-kut* to paw, to scrape with the foot (as a horse).  
*la-mya* to toddle (as a child).  
*la-pran* to brace the feet (for a pull).  
*la-lân* to retrace one's steps, to return.  
*la-wan* to hurry.  
*la-yât* to limp.

*la-krañ* to sprawl, to straddle the legs apart.  
*la-kriñ* to feel cramp in the legs.  
*la-kyeñ* to walk lame (as a splay-footed person).  
*la-tsi* to be footsore.  
*la-tsân* to keep the legs straight out (as when sleeping).  
*la-tâp* to have a white band around the leg (as an animal).  
*la-krip* to keep step.

With *la-tsa*, *la-tsañ* fingers, toes, we probably have concordance in :—

*la-gra* to spread the fingers.  
*la-ka* to wind between the thumb and little finger.

*la-pyâk* to snap the fingers (K'auri).  
*la-lek* to snap the fingers.

## § 86. Kachin *ša-*, *ǰa-*, Tibetan *-s-*

### K.

*ša-ren* to lengthen, to let out (fr. *ren* to be apart).  
*ša-dân* to expose to view, to lay bare (fr. *dân* to appear, to come into view).  
*ša-dan* to exhibit, to show (fr. *dan* to be plain or evident).

### T.

*sriñ-ba*, P. *bsriñs*, F. *bsriñ* to extend, to stretch, to lengthen. (Cf. *riñ-ba* long, high, tall.)  
*ston-pa*, P. and F. *bstan* to point at, to show. (Cf. *mton-ba* to see, to perceive, to behold.)

## K.

*ša-bra* to scatter, to disperse  
(fr. *bra* to be scattered).

*ša-wan* to purify, to cleanse  
(fr. *wan* to be clean or  
pure). (Cf. *a-wan* to be  
clear, to be clean.)

*ša-gat* to train the mind, to  
educate (fr. *gat* to be  
mature).

*ja-kkrat* to depose, to dismiss,  
to remove (as an official  
from office) (fr. *kkrat* to  
fall, to drop).

*ja-ŋep* to bring together, to  
join (vb. tr.) (fr. *ŋep* to  
be in close contact, to  
touch).

*ja-kkrit* to frighten (fr. *krit*  
to fear).

## T.

*spro-ba*, P. *spros* to send out,  
to disperse, to spread. (Cf.  
*apro-ba*, P. *apros* to issue, to  
emanate, to proceed, to go  
on, to continue.)

*sbyon-ba*, P. *sbyaṅs*, F. *sbyaṅ*  
to clean, to cleanse. (Cf.  
*abyon-ba*, P. *byaṅ* to be  
cleansed or purified.)

*skyed-pa*, P. *bskyed* to cause  
to grow, to bring up, to  
cultivate.

*skrod-pa*, P. and F. *bskrad* to  
eject, to drive out, to expel,  
to banish.

*sdeb-pa*, P. *bsdebs*, F. *bsdeb*,  
Imp. *sdebs* to join, to unite,  
to combine.

*žed-pa* (< (b)*sgred-pa*?),<sup>1</sup> also  
*bred-pa* (< *bgred-pa*?) to  
fear.

(b) *Elements Standing after the Main Verb Root*

§ 87. The tense particles at the left are as given in Hanson's *Kachin Grammar*. On the right I have attempted their analysis.

*Affirmative Mood*

Sing. 1st p. *-li-ai*

2nd p. *-lit-dai*

3rd p. *-lu-ai*

Plur. 1st p. *-ma-li-ai*

2nd p. *-ma-lit-dai*

3rd p. *-ma-lu-ai*

*Present Absolute Tense*

*-la-we-ai*

*-la-ét-ai*

*-la-wu-ai*

*-ma-la-we-ai*

*-ma-la-ét-ai*

*-ma-la-wu-ai*

<sup>1</sup> This reconstruction can also be made in *žen-pa* (< (b)*sgren-pa*?) to desire, to long for, a form paralleling *akren-pa* id.; *žig* in WT. *žig-mer* dense throng, crowded in a mass (< (b)*sgrig(-pa)*?) to crowd or crush together), a form paralleling *mkrig-ma* wrist (lit. joint), *akrig-pa* coitus, copulation, union; to collect, to stick together, to gather (as clouds); *agrig-pa* to be or belong together, to agree, to correspond, to suit; *sgrig-pa*, P. and F. *bsgrig*, Imp. *sgrig(s)* to put, lay, or fit together; K. *krik-rā* joint (lit. a loose or flexible (*rā*) union (*krik*)).

<i>Indicative Mood</i>		<i>Present Tense (a)</i>
Sing. 1st p.	- <i>nñai</i>	- <i>nñai-ai</i>
2nd p.	- <i>ndai</i>	- <i>nañ-êt-ai</i>
3rd p.	- <i>ai</i>	- <i>ai</i>
Plur. 1st p.	- <i>ga-ai</i>	- <i>ga-ai</i>
2nd p.	- <i>myit-dai</i>	- <i>ma-êt-ai</i>
3rd p.	- <i>ma-ai</i>	- <i>ma-ai</i>
		(b) Chiefly with verbs of motion
Sing. 1st p.	- <i>riñ-ñai</i>	- <i>ra-ñai-ai</i>
2nd p.	- <i>rin-dai</i>	- <i>ra-nañ-êt-ai</i>
3rd p.	- <i>ra-ai</i> ; <i>ru-ai</i>	- <i>ra-ai</i> ; - <i>ra-wu-ai</i>
Plur. 1st p.	- <i>ra-ga-ai</i>	- <i>ra-ga-ai</i>
2nd p.	- <i>ma-rin-dai</i>	- <i>ma-ra-nañ-êt-ai</i>
3rd p.	- <i>ma-ra-ai</i> ; - <i>ma-ru-ai</i>	- <i>ma-ra-ai</i> ; - <i>ma-ra-wu-ai</i>
		<i>Descriptive Present</i>
		I. Subjective
Sing. 1st p.	- <i>we</i>	- <i>we</i>
2nd p.	- <i>wu-ai</i>	- <i>wu-ai</i>
3rd p.	- <i>wu-ai</i>	- <i>wu-ai</i>
Plur. 1st p.	- <i>ga-ai</i> - <i>gã-ai</i>	- <i>ga-ai</i> (Singular Object) - <i>ga-wu-ai</i> (?) (Plural Object)
2nd p.	- <i>mi-ai</i>	- <i>ma-we-ai</i>
3rd p.	—	—
		<i>Descriptive Present</i>
		II. Objective
Sing. 1st p.	—	—
2nd p.	- <i>de-ai</i> - <i>di-ai</i>	- <i>de-ai</i> - <i>de-we-ai</i>
3rd p.	- <i>we-ai</i>	- <i>we-ai</i>
Plur. 1st p.	- <i>mi</i> - <i>mi-ai</i>	- <i>ma-we</i> - <i>ma-we-ai</i>
2nd p.	- <i>ma-de-ga</i> <sup>1</sup> - <i>ma-de-ai</i>	- <i>ma-de-ga</i> - <i>ma-de-ai</i>
3rd p.	- <i>nme-ai</i> <sup>2</sup> - <i>mu-ai</i> <sup>3</sup>	- <i>ñai-ma-we-ai</i> - <i>ma-wu-ai</i>

<sup>1</sup> This form seems out of place here. It looks more like the regular exhortative, and, as such, a 1st pers. plur. form.

<sup>2</sup> Subject 1st pers. sing. Another form of *-nme* used in some localities is *ma-we*, thus agreeing with *-mu* in its manner of formation.

<sup>3</sup> Subject 2nd or 3rd pers. sing.

*Perfect. I*

Sing. 1st p.	-se-ai	-sa-we-ai
2nd p.	-nu-ai	-na-wu-ai
3rd p.	-nu-ai	-na-wu-ai
Plur. 1st p.	-sa-ga-ai	-sa-ga-ai (Singular Object)
	-sa-gâ-ai	-sa-ga-wu-ai (?) (Plural Obj.)
2nd p.	-ma-nu-ai	-ma-na-wu-ai
3rd p.	-ma-nu-ai	-ma-na-wu-ai

*Perfect. II*

A second Perfect (Hanson's "Past Indefinite") is formed "by affixing *-sa* to all forms both singular and plural".

*Future*

Sing. 1st p.	-na-nñai	-na-nai-ai
2nd p.	-na-ndai	-na-nañ-êt-ai
3rd p.	-na-re	-na-ra-we
Plur. 1st p.	-na-ga-ai	-na-ga-ai
2nd p.	-na-myit-dai	-na-ma-êt-ai
3rd p.	-na-ma-ai	-na-ma-ai

*Definite Future*

Sing. 1st p.	-na-rin-nai	-na-ra-nai-ai
2nd p.	-na-rin-dai	-na-ra-nañ-êt-ai
3rd p.	-na-ra-ai ; -na-ru-ai	-na-ra-ai ; -na-ra-wu-ai
Plur. 1st p.	-na-ra-ga-ai	-na-ra-ga-ai
2nd p.	-na-ma-rin-dai	-na-ma-ra-nañ-êt-ai
3rd p.	-na-ma-ra-ai -na-ma-ru-ai	-na-ma-ra-ai -na-ma-ra-wu-ai

*Imperative Mood*

	Series A		Series B
Sing. 1st p.	-i, -e (-we)		
2nd p.	-u (-wu)		
	-nu (= -na-wu)	-nit	(= -na-êt)
	-ru (= -ra-wu)	-rit	(= -ra-êt)
	-su (= -sa-wu)	-sit	(= -sa-êt)
3rd p.	-u, -wu		
Plur. 1st p.	-mi (= -ma-we)		
2nd p.	-mu (= -ma-wu)		
	-ma-nu (= -ma-na-wu)	-ma-nit	(= -ma-na-êt)
		-ma-rit	(= -ma-ra-êt)
	-ma-su (= -ma-sa-wu)	-ma-sit	(= -ma-sa-êt)
3rd p.	-mu (= -ma-wu)		



§ 88. Among the elements in the analysed forms, *-ai* corresponds in a general way to Tibetan assertive *-o*, but differs from it in allowing not only the tense indices between itself and the root, but also (following the tense indices) objective and subjective elements as well.

A clear understanding of all these forms is not easy, but I have done what I could with them here, and before taking them in detail we may distinguish and tabulate the following three series: (1) Temporal Elements suffixed to the main verb root; (2) Objective Elements following the tense particle; (3) Subjective Elements prefixed to the assertive *-ai*.

### 1. TENSE SUFFIXES

Present (None)	Perfect I <i>-sa-</i> , <i>-na-</i>	Perfect II <i>-sa</i>	Future <i>-na-</i>	Definite Future <i>-na-</i>
-------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

2. OBJECTIVE SERIES			3. SUBJECTIVE SERIES		
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(3)
1st p. sing.	<i>-ra</i>		<i>nai-</i> ("I")	<i>we-</i>	
2nd p. sing.	<i>-ra</i>	<i>-de</i> , <i>-di</i>	<i>nan-</i> ("thou")	<i>wu-</i> (rarely <i>we-</i> )	<i>ét-</i>
3rd p. sing.	<i>-ra</i>			<i>wu-</i> (var. <i>we-</i> )	
1st p. plur.	<i>-ra</i>		<i>ga-</i> , <i>gá-(?)</i>	<i>ma-we-</i>	
2nd p. plur.	<i>-ra</i>	<i>-de</i>	<i>ma-nan-</i> ("you")	<i>ma-wu-</i> (rly. <i>ma-we-</i> )	<i>ma-yit-</i> (= <i>ma-ét-</i> )
3rd p. plur.	<i>-ra</i>			<i>ma-wu-</i> (var. <i>nai ma-we-</i> )	

### (1) Tense Suffixes

§ 89. *-sa*, *-sa* (Perfect I and II). This is probably the same element as Tibetan *-s*, and is similarly used.

*-na*. In view of the fact that the same suffix (*-s*) is common to both the perfect and imperative roots in Tibetan, it is worthy of note that *-na* in Kachin is likewise shared by these same two. The cause of this has been suggested in the case of Tibetan *-s* in § 49, and it is perhaps the same desire to have the action commanded, brought forthwith into a "Perfect" state, that has given rise to the use of *-na* in the Kachin Imperative. There is, however, on the other hand, a possibility that this Imperative *-na* is connected rather with the Future suffix *-na*, its use then indicating that the speaker commands that the action *shall* take place immediately. With this, the prohibitive (in *Kum*) is in agreement, as *-na* there (in the

2nd pers. form *-nit* (= *-na-êt*) removes the prohibition into the future.

Etymologically this element remains for the moment obscure.

## (2) *Objective Elements.*

### *Objective Series (1)*

§ 90. This is clearly associated in some way with motion or direction, extending the ordinary Present tense in this direction (*v.* § 87, Present (*b*)).

It is possible that this element may be equated with Tibetan infixed (directive) *-r-*, as otherwise this latter has no representative in Kachin, where as a prefix to the main root, *-ra-* is almost entirely wanting, occurring only as a very rare variety of *la*.<sup>1</sup>

In the Imperative, the forms *-ru* (*-ra-wu*) and *-rit* (*-ra-êt*) (plur. *-ma-ra-êt*) are used in the 2nd person where the command entails motion towards the speaker.

This, however, does not appear to be a very characteristic use of *-ra-*, its most usual force seeming to be a more general one of "to" or "towards", as in: *nan-tê-kâ yat-yañ nai sa-na-rin-nai* (= *na-ra-nai-ai*) lit. To you soon (by) me a coming there will (*-na*) to (*-ra*) (by) me (*nai-*) be (*-ai*).

It appears, however, at times as a link with the object where no motion is involved. Thus in: *ši ga-lâ-na-re* (= *na-ra-we*) lit. (By) him a doing there will (*-na*) as regards (it) (*-ra*) (by) him (*we-*; or *wu-?*) be (*-ai?*).

### *Objective Series (2)*

§ 91. This is almost too fragmentary to give us much idea of its possible signification, but it is likely that we have here the same dative and locative particle *-de* as used with substantives (indirect object).

## (3) *Subjective Elements*

### *Subjective Series (1)*

§ 92. This seems to be a known series of personal pronouns, deviating only in the 1st person plural from general usage. Perhaps *ga-*, *gâ-*, are cognate to Tibetan *kô* (*-bo*, *-mo*) I, we.

It seems possible that *gâ-* used with a plural object may be a fusion of subjective *ga-* with some objective element (perh. *wâ* demonstrative of distance "that, those"), though the

<sup>1</sup> See § 84.

possibility of vowel colouring (*a*, *â*) for singular and plural analogous to that for distance also suggests itself. These forms, however, are not clear to me.

### *Subjective Series (2)*

§ 93. It is possible that in this series we have in the 1st person an old demonstrative of proximity "this", and in the 3rd person a similar element of distance "that". In vocalization they stand to each other just as such demonstrative pairs do so often in the Assam area (*v.* § 102 *inf.*). *we-* (plur. *ma-we-*) would then align itself along with the elements in § 101, with which the Imperative forms: 1st pers. *-i -e*. 3rd pers. *-u*, show even closer agreement. On this assumption the usual 2nd pers. *wu-* of this series seems to have originated from the 3rd pers. by confusion, as the real 2nd pers. form may have been the rarer *we-*, notwithstanding its coincidence with the 1st person. This is indicated by the occurrence of *i* as an independent 2nd personal pronoun in Zahao, Lushei, Ngentê, and Hmâr of the Kuki-Chin area.

### *Subjective Series (3)*

§ 94. The one surviving form of this series, *êt-* of the 2nd person, is evidently the same as the second element in the Sopvomâ synonym compound *ni-êt* thou.

## THE SUBSTANTIVE

### *Elements standing before the Root*

§ 95. With the Kachin substantive we have only a limited concern here, as in the main it follows Tibetan.

The prefixes, however, very frequently differ, a fact due to its having used either a different root from Tibetan in the first component of its juxtaposed forms, or a different so-called "numerative".

The class of substantive represented by lapses of verb forms, is much further developed than in Tibetan, the *m-* and *b-* forms, which in Tibetan show only in a minority of cases a tendency to become entirely substantival, having in the great majority of instances fallen into this class in Kachin. With this we have already dealt in §§ 68-9, 73, 80.

The one new feature of the Kachin substantive which leads over directly to the younger languages, is its employment of

pronominal prefixes of the 2nd and 3rd persons (*n-* and *ka-* respectively) when family relationship terms are used with a genitive possessor, though this usage has not displaced the older non-pronominal *a-* (Tibetan 'a-) in such basic substantives, where the independent forms still retain this *a-*. "Father," for instance, is still *wa* or *a-wa* (T. *pá* or 'á-*pá*, 'á-*pa*), but *n-wa* is the form used for "your father" (*na n-wa*), *ka-wa* for "his father" (*ši-a ka-wa*).

## THE LANGUAGES OF ASSAM AND BURMA

§ 96. In the matter of morphology these languages stand in contrast to Tibetan and Kachin in not exhibiting the inflexible prefix systems which these latter possess.

Thus, except in some few definite instances, which will be discussed below, the elements composing the prefix systems of Tibetan and Kachin are lacking here, and are replaced by others much more recently introduced.

It is for this reason that we do not find in this area, except in Burmese (v. § 218), any evidence of the so-called "causative" formation which grew in Tibetan and Kachin out of the use of directive particles (particularly *-s-*), when the verb root was called upon to express a transitive or causative meaning.

The writer's views here agree neither with those of Conrady (*CB.* 36-7), nor with those of Sten Konow (*ZDMG.*, Bd. 56 (1902), pp. 495-7), who both believe there is a connection between the verbal prefixes *ga-*, *ka-*, *da-*, *tu-*, *ba-*, *pa-* according to Conrady, *ga-*, *ga-*, *di-*, *fa-*, *ft-*, *f-* according to Sten Konow, in the Bodo group, and the elements *g-*, *d-*, *b-* in Tibetan. In the first place these Tibetan elements are certainly neither causative nor transitive formatives, but the nature of the first two is directive, that of *b-* pronominal. Secondly, nearly every example of the supposedly corresponding cases adduced by Conrady from the Bodo group is reducible to (1) an adjectival derivative with the 3rd personal prefix of Series I in *g-* (see below, § 100), (2) a pair of verb roots juxtaposed, or a substantive + verb compound of which the first member is potentially instrumental, or (3) a late causative formation with the verb root "to give" in *p-* or *f-* prefixed, a formation in no way comparable to anything in Tibetan, and really a juxtaposed verbal compound.

Although its author has expressly stated his own doubts (p. 46), it does appear that much of the material in Conrady's *Causativ-Denominativ Bildung* is thrown together without very much thought.

A closer examination, for instance, would have revealed the fact that there is no prefix *du-*, *tu-*, with a transitive function anywhere in "*du-goi* (*du-gui-nũ*, Endle, *dũ-gwi-no*, Hodgs.)" to bathe oneself, *t'u-khoi* (*t'u-kũ-i-nũ*, Endle), to bathe another (*CB.* 36-7), but rather an instrumental substantive *du*, *tu* "with water", found again in Dimã-sã *du-gru* to bathe (*gru* = T. *akru-ba* to bathe, to wash; cf. Dim. *gru-bi* clean, clear, pure), and *di-gro ko* bathroom, which is very common in this language. Again, the root in "*go-d'zo* Stuck" (*CB.* 37) is *d'zo* (*fo*) to become less, to diminish, with which Tibetan *lag* day cannot be compared, while the prefix (*go-*) is that of the 3rd person, and in no way related to Tibetan *g-* in *g'zog* Future of *a'jog-pa* to cut. In "*ka-d'za* Easwaren" (*CB.* 37) again, the prefix is obviously *ka* mouth, and the compound comparable to Tibetan *ka-zas* food, and quite unrelated in

the matter of prefix with Tibetan *gzan-pa* to eat, in which the prefix is of entirely distinct origin. Yet again, to connect Bârâ *ga-saṅ-nũ* "aufrecht stehen" with Tibetan *gson-po* is quite a mistake, the latter meaning only "sincere" and having no connection with "standing". Further, the Bârâ prefix is that of the 3rd person (Series I), and the whole (*ga-saṅ-nũ*) an example of a re-conjugated adjective Bâ. *ga-saṅ* (Dîm. *gõ-son*) perpendicular, vertical, steep, from *saṅ* (or *son*) an old root meaning "to stand" (cf. ? : T. *bžens-pa* to rise, to get up). From the same root we also have in Dîmâ-sâ *son-bá*, *son-bî* steep.

In the case of the causative construction in *p-* or *f-*, Sten Konow's equation of Angâmi *pé-*, Mikir *pí-*, *pân-* (= *pá-in*) with Tibetan *b-* (ZDMG. 56, p. 497), though offered with reserve, will not stand, for the interpretation of Tibetan *b-* as a causative formative is certainly quite incorrect. The same remark applies to the suggested connection between the causative prefix *ti-* of Kabui and Tibetan *d-*.

For the element in *p-* or *f-* the writer cannot suggest any Tibetan equation, while the connections of Kabui *ti-* are rather with similar elements in the Kuki-Chin languages, such as Râltê *-tík*<sup>1</sup> suffixed, but the whole thing quite evidently belongs to an absolutely different, and much younger, stratum of Indo-Chinese language development than any of the prefixes of Tibetan, and he can only repeat that but for three elements belonging to the very oldest stratum of these languages, two of which are pronominal and are cognate to the Tibetan *m-* and *b-* elements of Series 0 (v. § 104), and one of which is directive (*-r-* in Mikir, *ra-* in Êmpêo, and certain related Old Kuki forms, v. §§ 164, 165, 177) and leads back to Tibetan *-r-*, the break with Tibetan in the matter of such elements is complete.

The lateness of nearly all the prefix usages in the Tibeto-Burman languages of Assam and Burma is everywhere evident.

As against Tibetan, which preserves what almost certainly represents the original system, peculiar to the verb, of pronominal prefix + directive infix, with no pronominal prefix system with the substantive, these languages with but certain important exceptions, which include the two pronominal elements of Series 0, and certain survivals of the old Tibetan directive *-r-*, have lost all trace of the prefixes and infixes peculiar to the original system, and employ in their stead comparatively newly introduced elements entirely strange, as morphological accretions, to the original system.

There has thus come about as one of the main results, an extensive pronominal shift,<sup>2</sup> which can be marked out in four

<sup>1</sup> This is probably cognate to Tibetan *aʃug-pa* (P. *bʃug*, F. *gʃug*, Imp. *éug*) to cause, to compel (cf. §§ 143, 155), to which, in the matter of vowel colouring (*i : u*) it stands in exactly the same relationship as the various pairs in § 117 *inf.* (*q.v.*).

<sup>2</sup> Compare Bastian *Sprachvergl. Stud.*, 217, who observed long ago that the personal pronouns in Indo-Chinese belong to the youngest language stratum "da sie sich noch beständig neubilden und gegenseitig ausstossen".

distinct stages, the whole of which had its origin somewhere back in the Tibetan pre-classical language, when an old 3rd personal element *ba*, which there is reason to believe once existed in this language as an independent pronoun, was withdrawn from independent use and confined to prefixed (and perhaps suffixed (*v.* § 24)) positions with verbs. And here, Tibetan, in preserving this element as a verbal prefix and lacking it as an independent element, parallels the younger languages, such as those of the Bodo, Nâgâ, and related groups, where elements permanently prefixed and demonstrably pronominal, are entirely and regularly withdrawn from independent usage where they once occurred.

The analogy goes even further, in that the 3rd personal *ko* of Tibetan (the independent pronoun which replaced the older *\*ba* when the latter became limited to prefixed usages), occupies in its place just the position which the various new demonstrative elements introduced by the Bodo, Nâgâ, and other languages, as independent pronouns, occupy in theirs, and, like them, was probably non-pronominal. It runs parallel and alternates with the demonstrative *de*, and was almost certainly not originally a personal pronoun.<sup>1</sup>

Is this the same element with which we meet as *ka-*, *ga-*, etc., prefixed to adjectival and participial derivatives from verb roots in the Bodo and Nâgâ groups, where it is demonstrably again an old 3rd personal (probably demonstrative) element ?

In the writer's opinion it almost certainly is, and he would sketch the first movement of pronouns which started the great shift, or series of shifts, noticeable in the younger languages of Assam, as follows : First, Tibetan independent *\*ba* becomes crystallized upon the verb and disappears from independent usage in favour of a new non-pronominal element *ko*. Second, this independent *ko* becomes crystallized in languages of younger development (Bodo, Nâgâ, etc.) on to the verb root as *ka-*, *ga-*, etc., giving place in these to new demonstrative elements which are, for the second time, introduced from the outside to replace a vanished predecessor.

Thus, all these subsequent pronominal usages are late, and differ from the original ancient Tibetan mother system in their function, which is no longer to repeat the subject, and their use, with adjectives and substantives as well as with verbs.

<sup>1</sup> *v.* Jk., *D.*, pp. 42-3, sub voc. *ko*.

## I. THE BODO, NÂGÂ, AND NÂGÂ-BODO LANGUAGES

*Preliminary*

## A

§ 97. The three prefixes of Series 0: Bârâ *ma-*, *mi-*, Dîmâ-sâ *ma-*, *mî-*, *mô-* = *me-* in Âo, *m-*, *n-* in Lhôtâ, *in-* in Mikir, *en-* in Êmpeô; *â-* in Âo = *e-* in Lhôtâ; and *-r-* (*âr-*) in Mikir . . . the only links which these languages have with Tibetan in the matter of prefixed morphological elements . . . correspond primarily to Tibetan *m-*; *b-*, *a-*; and *-r-*, though cross correspondences between the first two are natural. Thus, e.g. Âo *me-*, Lhôtâ *m-*, *n-*, Mikir *in-*, will frequently correspond to Tibetan *a-*, *b-*, instead of *m-* (v. §§ 138, 149, 160).

This lies in the original nature of these two elements, which is almost identical. In Tibetan the only difference (outside of the fact that *m-* is inseparable, *b-* separable) is, that *m-* is typical of the inactive intransitive verb, *b-* of the active verb, either intransitive or transitive, but both represent the subject, and thus can readily interchange. In fact, they supplement each other phonetically in Tibetan, *m-* appearing before aspirates where *b-* cannot occur.

Perhaps the lack of such restrictions to their position in Âo and Lhôtâ, has preserved in some cases a Tibetan original. It is possible in this way that, for instance Âo *â-si* to say, indicates original Tibetan *b-čî* (cf. *bśad-pa* to say), where *m-čî-ba* is now the form. We know, at all events, that there has been a movement among Tibetan prefixes since they lost their vowels.<sup>1</sup>

The preservation of directive elements, as Mikir *-r-* (T. *-r-*), is rarer, although there are scattered traces of such throughout this whole region, and there is no doubt that they were once more widely employed. Indeed, in some individual cases the whole mechanism is preserved, *i.e.* both a directive prefix and the suffix repeated. Thus, for instance, in Maring *nak-sam-ro ra-kol-bai* On (or round) the neck embracing (him) (LSI., iii, 2, 477).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> v. § 8, and Conrady, *CB.* 53.

<sup>2</sup> See especially § 165 *inf.*



§ 98. In opposition to this, it is characteristic of these languages that in many, directive elements are relegated to an infixed position *after* the verb root, where they tend to merge with the newly developed descriptive particles, and are actually among the best evidence we have of just what importance the prefixed (infix) directive elements of the older system (which they replace) actually were. For the more complete the absence of the latter, just so much more numerous are the particles used after the verb, until we reach a maximum in such a language as *Âo*, which has completely lost all its directive elements before the verb, but is provided with a complete series (dative, illative, ablative, etc.) infixed after it, giving such series as, e.g. *en-dok* to subtract, to take away, *en-tok*, *in-tok* to pour or throw out or away, *en-tok*, *me-in-tok* to drive away, *en-ok*, *in-ok*, *en-zak*, *in-zak* to pour or put down, *en-tâk* to throw against, *in-lok* to increase, to put together. Or, again, *me-sem-tep*, *me-sen-tep* to join together, *sen-tâk* to bind against, *me-ŷen-lok* to fasten together, *â-sen-ok* to put down (into), *sen-ŷi* to leave, to go away.

§ 99. The elements which especially characterize these languages are the guttural, or, more rarely, as in *Âo Nâgâ*, a dental prefix of the 3rd person belonging in Series I, this prefix affecting adjectives, verbal nouns, and in general de-verbal derivatives having their origin in 3rd personal descriptive juxtaposition.<sup>1</sup>

These elements are now all obsolete in independent usage, and with them begins the first of the successive movements of pronouns which leads one after another to become attached to verbs or substantives as a permanent prefix, and consequently disappear from use.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The manner in which the verb has thrown off through the 3rd person in all these younger languages of the Bodo, Nâgâ, Kuki-Chin, and intermediate groups, hosts of adjectival and participial derivatives, is a natural result of the general nature of the Tibeto-Burman verb.

In the 3rd person, in direct descriptive relationship with a preceding substantive, the verbal noun is naturally "his", "her", or "its" (*ga-*, *ka-*, *te-*, etc.) intimate property. In *Âo Nâgâ*, for instance, *ni-sun te-â-zun* (*te-â* = *tâ*, v. § 140) a good man, is literally "of (or, as regards) a man, his (*te-*) being good (*â-zun*)", and this descriptive relationship so generally occurring in this 3rd personal way has resulted everywhere in adjectives with 3rd personal prefixes, a process aided in great part by a general inability to think in the abstract (cf. LSI., iii, 3, pp. 16-17).

<sup>2</sup> So far as the writer knows, no serious attempt has as yet been made to discover the nature of these prefixes since Conrady published his

It is not easy in every instance to follow the sequence, as one set seems to have been peculiar to the verb, another to the substantive, but the order can usually be determined from superimposed forms such as Mikir *â-in-fin* liver, *â-ke-ve* green, unripe, Âo Nâgâ *te-â-kon* dry, which are very numerous. The succession of prefix forms is given in the table in § 104 below.

§ 100. The elements of Series I, *ga-*, *ka-*, etc., and *te-*, characteristic here as against Kuki-Chin and Burmese, are, as already stated in § 96, almost certainly traceable to the two old pronominal roots *kô* and *de* still surviving in independent use in Tibetan,<sup>1</sup> the pronominal shift thus having its origin back in comparatively ancient times.

Where one should look for a true 3rd *personal* pronoun in Tibeto-Burman is doubtful. *kô* and *de* in Tibetan are both probably demonstrative,<sup>2</sup> like *ga-*, *ka-*, and *te-* (as prefixes) in the Bodo and Nâgâ groups, and none of the later prefixes in these latter languages are personal. It is probable that *\*ma* and *\*ba* (> *-ma* and *-ba* suffixed, *m-* and *b-* prefixed to the verb) were also basically demonstrative (v. § 25), and these are the oldest of all.

How these languages have drawn upon the old pronominal material as preserved in Tibetan is, I think, clear. Those which retained the form *na* for the 1st person, drew for the 3rd, upon the root *kô* which became the prefix *ga-*, *ka-*, while those keeping *kô* (*-bo*, *-mo*) for the 1st, were forced, in order to avoid confusion, to employ *de*, which became later the prefix *te-*.

*Indochinesische Causativ-Denominativ Bildung.* He, however, like those following later, did not grasp their pronominal nature or connect them in any way with the constantly shifting demonstratives of this area. This is especially the case with the consonantal prefixes, the vocalic elements having more often been recognized as pronominal (v. e.g. LSI., iii, 2, p. 452 (Sopvomâ), 463 (Tângkhul)), probably by inference from Kuki-Chin, where their real nature could hardly escape one. Though in the LSI. (iii, 2 p. 416 (Kabui), 424 (Khoirâo)), certain obviously pronominal prefix usages with consonantal elements (*ka-*, etc.) are also noted, no connected attempt has since been made to elucidate the matter further.

<sup>1</sup> For the relationship of sonant and surd initials in this area to aspirates, in Tibetan, see below, § 107.

<sup>2</sup> As to *kô*, Jäschke (*Dic.*, 42-3) suggests that it was perhaps originally a substantive denoting "essence or substance", recognizing its non-personal nature. *de* we know is demonstrative "that".

This may be stated in tabular form in the following representative languages :—

	1st Person		3rd Person	
Tibetan	<i>na</i>	<i>ko</i> (- <i>bo</i> , - <i>mo</i> )	<i>ko</i>	<i>de</i>
Băṛā	<i>ān</i>	—	<i>ga-</i>	—
Āmā-sā	<i>an</i>	—	<i>ga-</i> , <i>gǎ-</i> , <i>gǎ-</i>	—
Gārō	<i>ān</i>	—	<i>gi-</i>	—
Tipurā	<i>ān</i>	—	<i>ka-</i> , <i>kā-</i> , <i>ku-</i> , <i>ku-</i>	—
Āo	—	<i>ka-</i> , <i>ke-</i> , <i>k-</i>		<i>te-</i> (prefix)

As it would be only after the gender suffix *-bo*, *-mo* was lost from the 1st personal root *ko* that it could be confused with 3rd pers. *ko*, we are probably correct in believing such loss in Āo occurred very early, as the substitution of *te-* (< T. *de*) is complete.

It may be added that this is no isolated case of “selection” of pronouns, but a conscious and natural effort at avoiding confusion. It is noticeable again, for instance, in the Western Pronominalized Himalayan Languages, where the 1st pers. form *ga* (Kanāwari), *gu* (Kanāshi), *ge* (Manchāṭi), *gē* (Chamba Lāhulī) conditions the use of *do*, *do*, *du*, and *du* respectively in the 3rd person (v. LSI., iii, 1, 532-3 ; 536-7).

§ 101. It is probable that in the case of the 1st person also, many of the languages of this area have drawn upon later demonstratives, as a series of forms exists which appears to be related to the Tibetan series in *a*, a series of proximity, “this” plur. “these” whence naturally “I” plur. “we”.

The Tibetan demonstrative series which also comes to function for 1st personal pronouns exhibits the following forms (plurals in *-čag*): <*a-čag*<sup>1</sup> we; <*o* this, we, <*o-čag*, <*o-čog*, <*o-skol* we; <*u* this, <*u-čag*, <*u-bu-čag* we; <*i* (WT.) (also *i*, *i-po*) this.

To this series the following may be allied. Āmā-sā *ē*, *i* this (§ 119 *inf.*), Gārō *ī* this (§ 129 *inf.*), Āo *ô-zô*, *ô-nok*, *â-sen*, etc., we (§ 136 *inf.*), and the roots *â-*, *î-*, *ê-*, this (§ 137 *inf.*), Lhôtā *ā* I (?), *e* we (§ 147 *inf.*), Mikir *î-*, *ê-* (inclusive) (§ 158 *inf.*), Êmpêo *ā* I (§ 174 *inf.*), this (§ 175 *inf.*), Tāngkhul *i* I (*i-tum*

<sup>1</sup> Sarat Chandra Das (*Dic.*, 1114) believes <*a* and <*a-čag* to be phonetic variants of *na* and *na-čag*.

we). Cf. also K'auri (K.) *i* we, Meithei *i* (-*hák*) I, Lakher (Central Chin) *i* I, *i*-*ma* we, and others.

§ 102. Thus we are able to trace back to their probable origins in Tibetan the prefixes of Series 0 and I in the table. Series II remains.

In this case the elements are all much younger, and have their affinities in the opposite direction—south, in the Kuki-Chin and Burma area. We shall return again to this later, when dealing with those languages.<sup>1</sup>

What is important here, is that the prefixes of the 3rd person in this series appear to have arisen from demonstratives of distance: “that, that one” which formed originally pairs with another series of demonstratives indicating proximity: “this, this one.” It is thus probable that those which are vocalic (the usual form in Series II), had originally as their partners of “proximity” the roots which we have traced above coming to function as 1st personal forms: “I” (lit. “this one”), we (lit. “these”).

And here we meet with a contrast in vowel colouring which is well in evidence throughout this area, viz. the heavier back vowels *á*, *ô*, *û* mostly in distance demonstratives “that”, the lighter front vowels *î*, *ê*, generally in those of proximity “this”.<sup>2</sup>

Pairs with this vowel colouring are in evidence in: Dîmâ-sâ *î-bô* (Plains dialect), *ê-bô* (Hills), this, as against *ô-bô* that (near at hand), also Dîm. *ê-ra*, *î-ra* here, but *ô-ra* there. Gârô has *î-â* this, but *û-â* that; *î-nô* here, but *û-nô* there. Semâ Nâgâ *hi-pau* this, but *hu-pau* that, *hi-lau* here, but *hu-lao* there. Âo Nâgâ *î-dâ-ge* here, but *ô-â-ge* there; *ei-len* this way (direction), *ô-len* that way (direction). In Râbhâ it emerges more distinctly as *i* this, *ô* that<sup>3</sup> (also “he”). In Êmpêo *ai* (= *â-i*?: v. § 175 *inf.*) this, but *û-i* that, whence *â-liâ* here, but *û-liâ* there. Again, in Lepcha

<sup>1</sup> See §§ 185-6.

<sup>2</sup> See again § 185 *inf.* For the same vowel contrast as known in other language families, see Meinhof, *Die hamitischen Sprachen*, p. 20; Werner, *The Language Families of Africa* (2nd ed.), pp. 108; 68-9; Simonyi, *Die Ungarische Sprache*, p. 255; Jespersen, *Language*, pp. 402-3; Benfey, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 791; Misteli, *Charakteristik der haupts. Typen des Sprachbaues*, p. 539; Wundt, *Die Sprache* (4th ed.), i, pp. 354-5; Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift, i, p. 638; Morris, *Grammar of the Telugu Language*, pp. 36-9; Caldwell, *Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages* (3rd ed.), pp. 420-1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Kachin, *wô*, *wâ* that.

we have *a* here, this, but *o* there, that. In Tibetan<sup>1</sup> *adi* this, *de* that, the same contrast, though less well marked, is present.<sup>2</sup>

§ 103. To be held strictly apart from these demonstrative elements is another prefix of the same outward form—Bârâ, Gârô, Angâmi, Âo â-, Dîmâ-sâ, and perhaps Sopvomâ. *a-*, apparently limited to substantives indicating family relationships, which seems to be traceable to the same source as Tibetan non-pronominal 'a-, also used with this class of substantive.

This element in the Assam area is now frequently confused with either the 1st<sup>3</sup> personal prefix which is generally of this same form, or with the 3rd personal (originally demonstrative) prefix with which we have just been dealing.

Two sources of confusion thus enter here, and it is a difficult matter to say just where we do meet with this element in this area.

Probably, however, it is found in those languages in which the prefix with family relationship terms differs from that of the 3rd person, which is generally found with substantives indicating parts of the human body. It may be present also in other cases, but the complete fusion with this other distinct pronominal element due to similarity of sound obscures it.

Gârô is one language in which we can gain a fairly clear view in the matter, as other prefixes which might cause confusion are absent, and although outwardly it seems possible to equate â- of Gârô with â- of the 1st person in Bârâ, as in e.g. *ân-ni â-fâ* my father,<sup>4</sup> a permanently adhering prefix of the 1st person would be quite anomalous here.

It is true that in the Gârô specimens in the Linguistic Survey<sup>5</sup> â- adheres in the 1st person, but is displaced in the

<sup>1</sup> In the Ladakhi dialect we meet with 'i this and 'a that, generally taking the forms 'i-bo and 'a-bo when used independently (v. Francke, *Ladakhi Grammar*, p. 23). The correspondence of these forms with those of Dîmâ-sâ given above is peculiarly close. The root elements take case suffixes, and then become demonstratives of place, e.g. 'i-ru here, 'a-ru there, which again strangely resemble the corresponding Dîmâ-sâ forms. Direct relationship, however, is improbable.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also Bastian, *Sprachvergl. Stud.*, 218-19.

<sup>3</sup> Coincidence in form with a 1st personal element would operate to remove this old prefix and allow the substitution in time of that of the 3rd person. The removal shows various degrees of completeness, as does likewise the substitution.

<sup>4</sup> v. Bârâ, § 116, and LSI., iii, 2, p. 16.

<sup>5</sup> iii, 2, pp. 75-80.

2nd and 3rd. So we have (translations acc. Grierson) : *á-pá* my father (pp. 75, 76), but *náñ<sup>o</sup>-nî pá-á* thy father (76), and *ú-nî pá-á* his father (76). Also *á<sup>o</sup>-tân pá-ô-ná* (he came) to his own father (75), and others.

On the other hand, *á-* is often added in composition to terms such as *bi-sa* child, which do not otherwise retain it as a permanent accretion, or use it in any personal sense. So in "The Story of the Doves" given by Playfair<sup>1</sup> we have e.g. *ú-á-mân á-bi-sá sák-bri* These four sisters (lit. children) (p. 120) ; *á-bi-sá-n mi-kô áá<sup>o</sup>-á-há* The (two) sisters ate their rice (p. 121) ; *ú-á-mân á-bi-sá-bá* The (two) sisters (came out from the pig-sty) (p. 121).

In none of these can *á-* be a prefix of the 1st person, and to the writer, it seems rather, as already stated, that *á-* is a non-pronominal formative probably akin to Tibetan 'a-. That it is not always displaced by the 1st person, but only by the 2nd and 3rd, may indicate Bârà or some other related influence. The dialect in the LSI. shows this possible influence the most clearly.

Judging then by dissimilarity from the 3rd personal element, a non-pronominal prefix may be present in :—

Bârà, which has *á-dá* brother (v. § 185, n. 2 (p. 178)), and the prefix of the 3rd person is *bî-* (Series II).

Dimâ-sâ, which has *a-dai* grandmother, *a-duñ* nephew, niece, *a-jañ* younger brother, *a-ju* grandfather, all only used impersonally as vocative forms (Dundas, *Gr.*, p. 99), while the prefix of the 3rd person is *ba-*, *bõ-*, *bũ-* (Series II).

Gârô, which has<sup>2</sup> *á-pá* father (Williamson's *á-fá*), *á-ǰá* father, *á-má* mother, *á-dá* brother, *á-no* sister, and a 3rd personal prefix is absent.

Tipurâ, which has *á-má* mother, *á-há-nok* sister, and the prefix of the 3rd person is *bo-*, *bu-* (Series II).

Angâmi, which has *á-po*, *á-pfo*, *á-pu* father,<sup>3</sup> and *u-* (Series II) as a 3rd personal prefix.

Âo, which has *á-di* elder brother, *á-nu* younger brother, *tá-nu* (*te-á-nu*) younger sister, *tá-nur* (*te-á-nur*) child, and the 3rd personal prefix is *te-* (Series I).

Êmpeo, which has *á-pêo* father, *á-púi* mother, *á-si* brother,

<sup>1</sup> *The Garos*, pp. 119–28.

<sup>2</sup> v. Williamson, JASB., vol. xxxviii (1869), pt. i, pp. 15–16.

<sup>3</sup> Not necessarily "my father" as translated in the LSI. (iii, 2, p. 248). The prefix is a permanent accretion. "Father" when detached still carries the prefix (v. McCabe, *Ang. Gr.*, pp. 3 ; 62).

*â-ki-nâ* sister, and the prefix of the 3rd person is *ba-*, *bâ-* (Series II).

Sopvomâ, which has *a-pû* father, *a-pê* mother, *a-ê-hû* brother, *a-tûi* sister, and the 3rd personal element is *u-* (Series II). In this case, however, there is additional doubt due to the fact that Sopvomâ is spoken in a region where great instability is found, due to "the confluence of two, if not of three, streams of language".<sup>1</sup>

§ 104. The following table giving the succession of prefixes in representative languages of the Bodo, Nâgâ, Nâgâ-Bodo, and Nâgâ-Kuki groups shows how the various pronominal prefixes of these languages correspond to one another.

Though they are not always related, elements in the same column correspond to a similar stage of development.

To emphasize the relationship in the first shift, the elements in Series 0 and I related to Tibetan *m-* and *de* respectively are starred. Those left unmarked in these two columns are related to Tibetan *b-*, *a-*, and *ko* respectively.

The element in *m-* in Series 0 with substantives is placed in square brackets, since (except in some few possible cases) it is not of pronominal nature. The linkage it provides with Tibetan, however, makes its entry in the table seem desirable.

<sup>1</sup> Hodson, *The Naga Tribes of Manipur*, p. 19.

	Series III			Series II						Series I						Series 0					
	Independent			Subst.			Verb			Subst.			Verb			Subst.			Verb		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Tibetan																					
Gârô	án-á	ná'-á	á-á																		
Bá'rá	án	nañ	bí			(bí)															
Dimá-sá	añ	nuñ	bó			ba- bó- bă-															
Tipurá	án	nuñ	bo			bo- (bu-?)															
Angámi	á	no	po			u-												?			
Semá	ní	ná	pá			á-												?			
Rengmá	á	né	á			á-															
Kezhámá	ye á	no	pu			e pu-															

Bodo

Western Nag



Áo Naga Central	ní	ná	pá	{ ? }	<.....	{ ka- ke- k- }	ne- }	te-*	{ me- [mo-] [mu-] }	me- á-
Lhótá	ai	ní	ó-mó hí sĩ		ó-				{ m- [n-] }	m- n- e-
Mikir	né	nan	pe, pi pá, lá		á-	á-		ke- ki- ká-	[in-]	in-*
Êmpéo Naga-Bodo	á-nái	nán	fí		ba- bá-				{ hen- [en-] }	en-*
Kabui	ái	nan	ka-mai				ka-?			
Khoiráo	hai	nan	pái		(pái)			ká-		
Sopvomá	yi	ní né	ha-na po	a- ni	u-, a-? ma-?			ka- ká-		
Tangkhum	i	na	á		á-			ka- ká-		
Maring Naga-Kuki	kai	nan	á	kai nai na	á- ma-?			ka-		

In this table, if we were to discard the newer accretions—Series II and III—or, in other words, if we should move all the elements back in the table two places, so that Series I stood in the place of Series III, Series 0 in that of Series II, each language would then be equipped with the same machinery that Tibetan still possesses, viz. the independent 3rd person demonstrative elements *kó* and *de* (= *ka-*, *ga-*, etc., and *te-*) and the third personal verbal prefixes *b-*, *a-* (= *á-*, in Áo, *e-* in Lhótá), *m-* (= *me-* in Áo, *m-*, *n-*, in Lhótá, etc.); and the substantival prefix *m-* (= *me-*, *mo-*, *mu-*, in Áo, *m-*, *n-* in Lhótá, etc.).

## B

§ 105. Though there is naturally no very definite dividing line in such matters between these languages and Tibetan, there is a clear division of roads when we leave the Tibetan region, as can readily be seen in the method of turning the verbal noun root to adjectival uses.<sup>1</sup>

The older Tibeto-Burman adjectival constructions may be divided roughly into two kinds. In one, the property or condition which the adjective ascribes to the substantive is treated grammatically as being one of present time<sup>2</sup> with which the substantive is in intimate relation. These may be called Relative Participle adjectives. In the other, the property or condition ascribed is regarded as a state already attained or arrived at. These are the Perfect tense adjectives.

Whenever in these younger languages an adjective appears only with a prefixed pronominal (demonstrative) element, both these older constructions have been replaced by a third. This method with prefixed demonstrative is the only one of the three not found both in Tibetan and the Assam area, being peculiar to the latter alone.

The two older methods of adjectival construction form the point of departure for two of the three developments which we find in the Assam area, in tracing which we may take first the Relative Participle constructions and see what has become of them.

Very frequently these have survived, though the suffixes by means of which they are formed are unrelated to those of Tibetan, as will be shown below. *Dîmâ-sâ*, for instance, still perpetuates the principle, and adjectives otherwise using the younger prefix method with *ga-*, *gǎ-*, *gǔ-*, can still regularly suffix a relative<sup>3</sup> giving such forms as *mâ-saiñ-ǰû hām-bâ* a good woman (lit. a woman, one who (-bâ) is good), *ân-câ hām-bâ* a good child, *wah-du gě-ǰep-bâ* a tight rope (lit. a rope, that one (-bâ) of which (gě-) a being tight (there is)).

<sup>1</sup> See also § 68.

<sup>2</sup> This is probably the older of the two methods and in Tibetan employs *-ba*, *-pa* suffixed to the verbal noun. Thus *bu-mo mdzes-pa* a beautiful girl, is literally "a girl, one who (-pa) is beautiful".

<sup>3</sup> *-bâ*, *-bî*, which Dundas (*Dîm. Gr.*, 5) notes under adjectives are really relative constructions, *-bâ* that (one which), *-bî* this (one which) (whence in the latter case the appearance of emphasis noted by Dundas). The sense of *-bî* is clear in e.g. *ê-bô ân-câ hām-bî* this child is good, *ê-bô dî tû-bî tî* is this water deep?, and is even more readily recognizable in *lam-a be-leñ-bî* the (lit. this) road is straight, *ba-kô ri-sî-bî* the (lit. these) loads are heavy, where *-bî* does not have the support of *ê-bô* this (*v. Dundas, op. cit.*, pp. 5, 22-3, 26-7, etc.). The vowel colouring for proximity and distance noted in § 102 occurs again here.

	A <sup>1</sup>				B <sup>1</sup>			C <sup>1</sup>			
	Tibetan	Dĩmâ-sâ	Âo	Lhôtâ	Ao	Lhôtâ	Êmpêo	Dĩmâ-sâ	Âo	Lhôtâ	Mikir
ripe	<i>smin-pa</i>						<i>me-dá</i>	<i>gĩ-min</i> <i>gũ-mun</i>	<i>tá-men</i>	<i>e-nhe<sup>n</sup></i>	<i>ke-men</i>
bitter	<i>ka-ba</i>	<i>ká-bá</i>			<i>ku-ku-r</i>	<i>kó-á</i>	<i>ká-dá</i>	<i>ga-ká</i>	<i>tá-ku</i>	<i>e-šó<sup>n</sup></i> <i>e-rá<sup>n</sup></i> <i>e-he<sup>n</sup></i>	<i>ke-ho</i> <i>á-ban</i>
old	<i>rin-pa</i> <i>rgad-pa</i>							<i>ga-šám</i>	<i>te-zen</i> <i>tá-zá</i> <i>tá-in</i>	<i>e-šó<sup>n</sup></i> <i>e-rá<sup>n</sup></i> <i>e-he<sup>n</sup></i> <i>e-ke</i> <i>e-la<sup>n</sup></i>	<i>á-ban</i>
new	<i>gsar-ba</i> <i>so-ma</i>							<i>ga-dain</i>	<i>tá-sen</i>		<i>á-ki-mi</i>
long	<i>rin-ba</i>	<i>lao-bá</i> <i>lao-bí</i>			<i>te-lân-ká</i> (B + C) <i>á-pi-gá</i> (B + C) <i>tá-tsa-ká</i> (B + C)	<i>e-pi-á</i> (B + C)		<i>ga-lao</i>			<i>ki-din</i>
short	<i>fun-ba</i>	<i>sun-bá</i>			<i>á-wán-er</i> (B + C)	<i>e-lam-á</i> (B + C)	<i>lám-dá</i>	<i>gũ-sun</i> (Bá.)	<i>tá-tsa</i>		
warm	<i>dron-mo</i> <i>dro-ba</i>	<i>(duñ-bá)</i>	<i>lem-lá</i>		<i>á-pe-r</i> (B + C)	<i>lam-á</i> <i>e-pi-á</i> (B + C)		<i>gũ-duñ</i>	<i>á-ro</i> <i>tá-tsak</i>		<i>ká-rom</i>
hot	<i>tsa-ba</i>	<i>sá-bá</i> <i>sá-bí</i>				<i>tszó-á</i>					
cold	<i>grañ-ba</i>	<i>ga-sain-bí</i> (A + B)			<i>á-sak-er</i> (B + C) <i>mo-koñ-er</i>	<i>myim-á</i>	<i>hê-gê-dá</i>	<i>ga-sain</i>	<i>te-mo-koñ</i>	<i>(n-koñ)</i>	<i>ke-čun</i> <i>kân-sam</i> <i>(ká-in-sam)</i>
alive	<i>gson-po</i>							<i>ga-tân</i>	<i>tá-kam</i>	<i>e-kam</i>	<i>ke-reñ</i>
dead	<i>ači-ba</i> <i>ši-ba</i> (P.) (both = "death")	<i>ti-bá</i>				<i>či-á</i>	<i>šai-dá</i>	<i>gĩ-fi</i>	<i>tá-sa</i>		<i>ke-fi</i>
full	<i>geñ-ba</i>	<i>ga-blai-yá-bá</i> (A + B)				<i>píyañ-á</i>	<i>pui-dá</i>		<i>á-sun</i>		<i>ke-pleñ</i>
empty	<i>ltem-pa</i> <i>mfon-po</i> <i>ston-pa</i>		<i>tá-zan-lá</i> (A + B)				<i>gá-dá</i>			<i>e-čan</i>	<i>á-ke-šoi</i> <i>ăn-se</i> <i>(á-in-se)</i>

<sup>1</sup> Under A are placed forms with the old indefinite suffix usage, under B those derived directly from verbal tense forms with a suffix of time, under C forms in which the new pronominal prefix principle appears.

The suffixed demonstrative forms in column A are: T. *-ba*, *-pa*, *-ma*, Dim. *-bá*, *-bí*, Âo *-lá*.

The tense suffixes in column B are: Âo, Present (Participial) *-r*, *-er*, Perfect (Participial) *-gá*, *-ká*, Lh. Perfect *-á*, Êmpêo, Perfect *-dá*.

The prefixed demonstratives in column C are: Dim. *ga-*, *gĩ-*, *gũ-*, Âo *te-* (*tá-* = *te-á*, v. § 140), Lh. *e-*, M. *ke-*, *ki-*, *ká-*, *á-* (*á-ke-*, *á-ki-*).



In purely adjectival usages the prefix has replaced the older suffix method in Dîmâ-sâ, a process which is noticeable again in the more clearly transitional languages.

Thus in the North Assam group, a clearly transitional area, Daflâ when using *-bâ*, *-pâ* after adjectives (really verbal noun roots) when qualifying substantives, retains the Relative Participle method in e.g. *nâ â-(s)so-bâ* a long boat (lit. boat, a being long, one which = T. *gru rin-ba*), but Miri discards it, and would render the same sentence *ê-lûn bâ-dôn* lit. a boat of which (*bâ-*) a being long (there is), in this matter definitely aligning itself with the typical Bodo and Nâgâ language in prefixing a genitive element.<sup>1</sup> That actually the same ancient pronominal element, or what is most likely such (*-bâ*, T. *-ba*), is here itself transferred from suffixed to prefixed usage, places the two methods in an interrelationship which we do not find further south, where these elements have their affinities with much younger ones, probably of Series III (v. § 104).

The second of the two older methods, again, has its direct descendants throughout the Assam area. Êmpêo, for instance, continuing on the way forecast by Tibetan (§§ 49-55) regularly builds out its adjectival derivatives through the Perfect tense of the verb by means of temporal suffixes, the method of the suffixed demonstrative having disappeared.

Naturally to some extent these two older types exclude the use of the newer method with prefixed demonstrative, and such a language as Êmpêo which carries the older principle into territory now taken over by the newer personal prefix idea naturally makes but small use of prefixes itself.

The accompanying table of adjectival forms shows how the older methods of construction, and the younger in which prefixes appear, though overlapping, in large part replace each other.

<sup>1</sup> Miri, in fact, has already a certain number of permanently crystallized forms with the prefix inseparably adhering, among them *bâ-tê* great, *bâ-je* many, *bâ-don* long (LSI., iii, 1, p. 589; Needham, *Outl. Gr. Shaiyang Miri*, 114 *et seqq.*). Logically this element *bâ* should be the genitive of *ba*, one of the demonstrative bases common to Miri and Daflâ (LSI., iii, 1, p. 595), just as *sâ* is the genitive of Miri and Daflâ *sâ* this, and *hâ* the genitive of *ha* that. We should expect a genitive with the prefix, but *-hâ* as a suffix must remain in doubt, as we should not look for a genitive there. On the employment in Miri of *bâ* as a prefix with *bâ* father, Sten Konow (LSI., iii, 1, p. 590, n. 1) calls attention to the interesting fact that "In the parable [*op. cit.*, pp. 608-10] *â-bâ* father, is used in the first sentence, while afterwards only the form *bâ-bâ* occurs". From this it appears probable that *bâ* is the above-mentioned Miri and Daflâ demonstrative base *ba* used reflexively, "that one" (already mentioned), the same base, in fact, which gives rise to the supposedly genitive form *bâ*. Incidentally confirmation also comes to hand here that the prefix *â-* is non-pronominal in this area (see § 185).

§ 106. An important feature which is at once noticeable here is that although the old indefinite suffix formation represented by Tibetan *-ba*, *-pa*, *-ma* shows a decided tendency to fall out when the demonstrative prefixes are introduced, there are some languages in which this is not so noticeably the case, in which one is able to see more clearly the exact difference between the two sets of elements. This appears to consist in the fact that the indefinite suffixes, Tibetan *-ba*, *-pa*, *-ma*, Dîmâ-sâ *-bâ*, *-bî*, Gârô *-pâ*, etc.,<sup>1</sup> do not express any demonstrative idea, but are very indefinite and about equal to "such as, one who, one which, one" (Ger. *man*, Fr. *on*), or, what is with us the indefinite article "a, an", while, on the other hand, the prefixed roots *ga-*, *ka-*, *te-* being demonstrative pronouns exhibit always their demonstrative signification "that (which)".

In this way it arises that while such a form as, for instance, Dîm. *dê-bâ* thick, is lit. being thick-one which (is), *gě-dê-bâ* is rather "being thick-that (*gě-*) one which (*-bâ*) is".<sup>2</sup> This appears again clearly in Gârô, where instead of being placed before the main root, the newly used demonstrative element *-gi-* is placed after it, but before the suffix *-pâ* which it thus strengthens from an indefinite "one who, one which" into "that one who, that one which"; *pâ-gi-pâ* lit. that (*-gi-*) one who (*-pâ*) is father, *dok-gi-pâ* lit. that (*-gi-*) one who (*-pâ*) is striking, i.e. a striker.

From this alone it is evident that we are not dealing here with a replacement of one element by another, as the two are not equivalent (although in their strongest development in some languages the prefixed demonstrative does actually usurp also the functions of the old suffix).

It is probably correct to regard the first introduction into

<sup>1</sup> Relationship must not be supposed between these elements and the Tibetan suffixes, but is better sought with the independent demonstratives of their own area. These relationships, however, are not always clear. Ao *-bâ* may be related to independent *pâ* of Series III, and some similar connection may be expected in the remaining cases. Equation with Tibetan *-ba*, *-pa*, would presuppose the survival of the old demonstrative root lost in independent use from Tibetan some time prior to the seventh century, which can be traced only in survivals falling in Series O. Affinity with Series III should probably be generally sought.

<sup>2</sup> Better, perhaps, "one (*-bâ*) of which (*gě-*, genitive by position) a being thick there is", i.e. "a thick one". The basic sense of such double usages is probably everywhere in this area the same. Khoirão *ka-tâ-bâ* lit. one (*-bâ*, suffixed demonstrative) of whom (*ka-*, prefixed demonstrative) a being young (there is), i.e. he who is young, the younger son; Angâmi *ke-bâ-mâ* lit. one (*-mâ*) of whom (*ke-*) a remaining (there is), i.e. one who remains, a dweller; Ao *te-â-zun-bâ* lit. one (*-bâ*) of whom (*te-*) a being good (there is), i.e. a good one, etc., etc.

a language of the prefixed demonstrative usage (as affecting adjectival and verbal noun derivatives) as being the first step in transition from the older grade language of Tibetan to the younger grade of the Bodo, Nâgâ, Kuki-Chin and intermediate groups.

### C.

§ 107. Consonantal relations among these languages are in many points obscure, as is also their standing to Tibetan.

In many instances relationship cannot possibly be denied between a word in this area with sonant initial and a Tibetan form with an aspirate, and vice versa, yet, if the laws governing pitch tones in these languages are those usual elsewhere in the Family, we are comparing a low with a high-toned word, or the reverse.

Though our information with regard to tones in this area is practically nil, it is evident from occasional notations such as those made by Pettigrew in his *Tangkhul Naga Grammar and Dictionary* that the same word (whether with surd, sonant, or aspirated initial) may in this language at least, be either high or low toned quite irrespective of its initial. Evidently tones give no guidance here. *mi* man, low toned in Tibetan, is here high toned : *mî* ; *ʔa-ne* aunt, high toned in Tibetan, is low toned here : *ʔâ-nî*.

In many instances it looks as though the cognate to a Tibetan word now high toned in Tibetan, i.e. with aspirated initial, had weakened an original surd to a sonant. This relationship is quite common, and occurs, among numerous instances, in Dimâ-sâ *dî gru*<sup>1</sup> to bathe (*dî* = "water" (whence *gru-bî* clean, pure, *gũ-gru* pure (of water)), Bârâ *du gûi* to bathe oneself,<sup>2</sup> T. *q̄krud-pa*, or *q̄kru-ba*, P. *bkrus*, F. *bkru*

<sup>1</sup> Although *dî. du* water, stands to Tibetan *ču* just as other roots of this section, it may be legitimate to inquire if Dimâ-sâ *dî gru, du gru, Bârâ du gûi* and its transitive partner *tu kûi* ("to bathe others") are not possibly hendiadys forms (\**k̄rus âkru-ba*). Such forms as Dimâ-sâ *dî, du, Bârâ dîi, du, tu, Lâlung dî, Tipurâ tui* water, and many other Bodo, Nâgâ, and Kuki-Chin relatives would then be referable to the Perfect *k̄rus* of the Tibetan verb *akru-ba* to wash, which, indeed, in Tibetan assumes the meanings "bath, washing, ablution", and in its modern dialectic variations : Sp. *tui*, Ts., Ü., Kh. *tū* approaches closely the Bodo and Nâgâ forms. The strong tendency to replace the old vowel (*u*) by *i*, common in this area, is very well explainable in the present instance if the root formerly had a final -s, as final -s in Tibetan always moves the preceding vowel forward (*dus* > *dū*, *d'ū* ; *ras* > *rū* ; *gos* > *gō*, *g'ō*). Equivalence between Dimâ-sâ dental (or, better, cerebral ?) initial and Tibetan guttural with *ra-tag* occurs again in *tik* accurate, correct, CT. *k̄rig-k̄rig* (pr. *trik-trik*) accurate, sure, a form related to *agrig-pa* (> CT. and WT. (Jäschke) *dig*, CT. (Bell) *drik-pa*) to be right, to be correct. For the same relation between this root in Mikir and Tibetan, see § 160, n. (p. 157).

<sup>2</sup> Notice the original (?) surd in the transitive form *tu kûi* to bathe others.

to wash, to bathe (cf. Angami *krö* with the original (?) surd), or, again, in Gârô *grap*, Dîmâ-sâ *grâ*, Bârâ *gâb* (Endle), *gâp* (Anderson, LSI., iii, 2, p. 8) to cry, to weep, Tibetan *krab-krab* a weeper (Kachin *krap* to weep), with which compare Thâdo *kâp*, Siyin *kap*, *kab*, with the original (?) surd. Again the relation occurs in Dîmâ-sâ *gě-dê-bâ*, Bârâ *ga-det*, T. *ċe-ba*, *ċen-po* great; Gârô *wâk*, Ao *âk*, Lhôtâ *wôk*, Êmpéo *ga-bâk*, T. *pag* pig.

Similarly surds frequently run Tibetan aspirates parallel, as in Gârô *ċon* (also *joñ*) young, T. *ċun(-ba)*; Gârô *ċi* water, T. *ċu*; Ao *me-ċi* lip, T. *mċu*.

Such pairs as this stand to each other just as the 3rd personal prefix *ga-*, *gĩ-*, *gũ-* (also *ka-*, etc.) stands to Tibetan *kō*, the suggested relationship between which (v. § 96) thus finding decided support.

## A. BODO LANGUAGES

### *Bârâ* <sup>1</sup>

#### *Preliminary*

§ 108. Though in most respects younger phonetically than Dîmâ-sâ, Bârâ nevertheless preserves in some cases older forms.

Thus final *-t* or *-ṭ* (the latter a cerebral often interchanging with *r*), frequently remain, where Dîmâ-sâ has the same root without a final.

Instances are :—

Bâ. <i>ga-fût</i>	Dîm. <i>gũ-pû</i>	white.
<i>ga-det</i>	<i>gě-dê-bâ</i>	great.
<i>haṭ</i>	<i>hai</i>	to send.
<i>săt</i>	<i>sai</i>	to scatter, to sprinkle.
<i>ăt</i>	<i>wai</i> <sup>2</sup>	fire.
<i>tăt, taṭ</i>	<i>tai</i>	to kill.
<i>kăt</i>	<i>kai</i>	to run.
<i>băt</i>	<i>bai</i>	to cross over, to traverse.

## § 109.

### PERSONAL PRONOUNS

Independent      Possessive (= Gen. in *-ni* (or *-hă*))

Singular

1st p. <i>ân</i>	<i>ân-ni, ân-hă.</i>
2nd p. <i>nan</i>	<i>nan-ni, nan-hă.</i>
3rd p. <i>bî</i>	<i>bî-ni, bî-hă.</i>

<sup>1</sup> In this language *ă* = Endle's *ă* (or short *a* in "pan"), *û* his *ü* (v. Endle, *Gr.*, 3).

<sup>2</sup> A connection made clearer by Mech (Jalpaiguri) *wăt*. Gârô *wă°al* clarifies the probable connection of this root with Tibetan *qbar-ba* to burn, to blaze, to be on fire. Compare also Thâdo, Siyin, Lushei, Bêtê *hăl* to set fire to, to ignite (= T. *sbor-ba*, P. and F. *sbar*).



Independent	Possessive (= Gen. in <i>-ni</i> (or <i>-há</i> ))- Plural
1st p. <i>zañ, zañ-far</i>	<i>zañ-ni</i> (or <i>-há</i> ), <i>zañ-far-ni</i> (or <i>-há</i> ).
2nd p. <i>nañ-sar</i>	<i>nañ-sar-ni</i> (or <i>-há</i> ), <i>nañ-ni</i> (or <i>-há</i> ).
3rd p. <i>bî-sar (bî-far)</i>	<i>bî-sar-ni</i> (or <i>-há</i> ), <i>bî-ni</i> (or <i>-há</i> ).

The 3rd personal element *bî* is a demonstrative (§ 110) replacing the old guttural root in § 112, once independent.

### § 110. DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

Simple root form	Singular	Possessive	Plural
<i>bê</i>	<i>bê</i> this	<i>bê-ni, bê-há</i>	<i>bê-sar (bê-far)</i> .
<i>boi</i> (or <i>bô?</i> )	<i>boi</i> that (near at hand)	<i>boi-ni, boi-há</i>	<i>boi-sar (boi-far)</i> .
<i>bî</i>	<i>bî</i> that (remote)	<i>bî-ni, bi-há</i>	<i>bî-sar (bî-far)</i> .

### THE VERB

#### (a) Elements Standing before the Root

##### 1. *ma-, mi-* of Series 0

§ 111. This prefix (= T. *m-*) occurs before the following verbs :—

Bà. <i>ma-năm</i> to smell.	T. <i>mnam-pa</i> (intr.).
<i>mi-nî</i> to laugh, to smile.	
<i>mi-îi</i> to know, to understand.	

##### 2. *ga-* of Series I

§ 112. The old pronominal prefix of this Series occurs before the following representative verbal noun derivatives (adjectives), and is one with Dîmâ-sâ *ga-, gě-, gĩ-, gǒ-, gǔ-* § 121 *inf.*).

Bà. <i>ga-det</i>	Dîm. <i>gě-dê-bá</i>	great, large.
<i>ga-lau</i>	<i>ga-láo</i>	long.
<i>ga-ká</i>	<i>ga-ká</i>	bitter.
<i>ga-táu</i>	<i>gĩ-dî</i>	sweet.
<i>ga-zau</i>	<i>gǔ-ǰú</i>	tall.
<i>ga-sam</i>	<i>gĩ-sim</i>	black.
<i>ga-zá</i>	<i>ga-ǰáo</i>	red.

##### 3. The Causative Prefix *fa-, fĩ-*

§ 113. The causative element is *fa-, fĩ-*, as in *fĩ-sî(-nú)* to cause to be wet, to steep, to soak, from *sî-nú* to be wet.

This usage has been largely supplanted by the verb *hũ-nú* to give, placed after the main root (*v.* § 115 *inf.*).

(b) *Elements Standing after the Root*

## 1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 114. Among these are the following :—

-*tra*-<sup>1</sup> with completive force = adv. “wholly, completely” (= Dîm. -*târ*-, § 123).

*kām* to burn (intr.), *kām-tra*- to be completely burned up.

-*srā*- of entirety = “well, entirely, completely” (cf. Gârô -*srân*-, § 131).

*sū* to clean (clothes), *sū-srā*- to clean well.<sup>2</sup>

-*fin*- of repetition = adv. “again” (= Dîm. -*pîn*-, § 123, Gârô -*pîl*-, § 131).

*fai* to come, *fai-fin*- to come back, to return.

-*sû*- seems to be intensive in force, “much, many.”

*bār* to be windy, *bār-sû*- to be very windy, to blow strongly.<sup>3</sup>

*dañ* to be, *dañ-sû*- to be many.

*sañ* to bark, *sañ-sû*- to bark a great deal.

-*bai*- with continuative force (cf. ? Gârô -*bê*-, § 131, -*bā*-, § 132), is perhaps an adverb of repetition “again, again and again, continuously”.

*bîr* to fly, *bîr-bai*- to fly about continually.

-*zlai*-, -*lai*- with reciprocal force = “each other.”

*ât* to bite, *ât-zlai*- to bite each other (as dogs).

*kā* to bind, *kā-lai*- to bind together, or mutually (as by word). Perhaps, however, this is a verb root.

Anderson (LSI., iii, 2, p. 9) gives *lai*, *slai*, *zlai* to exchange, Dundas (*Dîm. Gr.* 157) *sa-lai* to alter, change, or exchange.

Possibly going back to verb roots, and then strictly not belonging here, we have :—

-*lân*- indicating “motion away, out or forth from”, probably from *lân* to take away, to remove.

*bîr* to fly, *bîr-lân*- to fly away.

The idea of completeness or intensification suggested by Endle<sup>4</sup> for this particle does not seem to be its basic force.<sup>5</sup> It occurs again in Dîmâ-sâ (§ 124).

-*bô*- seems to indicate “motion towards the speaker” (= Dîm. -*bû*-, § 124, Gârô -*bā*-, § 132).

*lâ-bô* (or *lâ*) to bring, convey or fetch.

<sup>1</sup> Anderson (LSI., iii, 2, p. 13) writes *thrâ* (i.e. *trâ*). <sup>2</sup> r. LSI., iii, 2, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Dîm. -*yun* in *bâr-yun* big wind. As a suffix with substantives -*yun* gives a sense of largeness; *mî-yun* an elephant (the largest animal), etc.

<sup>4</sup> *Outline Grammar*, p. 27, § 19 (a).

<sup>5</sup> Usages such as *û-dû-lân*- to sleep soundly, *bû-lân*- to beat hard, probably embody another particle -*lân*-, perhaps emphatic. I have not included it here.

## 2. The Causative Infix.

§ 115. The causative infix following the verb is *-hũ-* (= *hũ-nũ* to give). It appears to be a younger construction than *fa-*, *fĩ-* preceding it (v. § 113).

It can be employed either with the root, as in : *zâ-hũ-* to cause to eat, to feed, from *zâ* to eat ; *nai-hũ-* to cause to see, to show, from *nai* to look, to see, or, with the main root in the Infinitive (*-nũ*), when it still exerts its independence as a separate verb, as in : *nũ-nũ hũ-gan* (Fut.) will show ; *nũ-nũ hũ-bai* (Perf.) shown, etc. (cf. Êmpêo in § 179).

### THE SUBSTANTIVE

#### *Elements Standing before the Root*

#### *bĩ-* of Series II

§ 116. This prefix does not adhere as a permanent accretion to the substantive, so does not need further treatment here other than to note that it repeats before the substantive the full 3rd personal pronoun which has immediately preceded it, just as do *nan-* or *nam-* of the 2nd person, and *â-* of the 1st.

Thus we have, e.g. *ân-ni â-fâ* my father, *nan-ni nan-fâ* or *nan-ni nam-fâ* your father, and *bĩ-ni bĩ-fâ* his father.

#### DİMÂ-SÂ<sup>1</sup>

#### *Preliminary*

§ 117. Dìmâ-sâ, or Hills Kachari, being less exposed to Assamese influence than Bârâ, naturally shows many older traits, and agrees better with Gârô than does the Plains dialect.<sup>2</sup>

As against this latter Dìmâ-sâ will not infrequently have an older form, preserving in fact, in many cases, finals lost from both Gârô and Bârâ, in this approaching more closely than either the primitive tongue (v. § 127).

Thus in many roots Dìmâ-sâ preserves a final *-n* or *-ñ*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The notes on this language are based on the materials offered by Dundas in his *Outline Grammar* rather than on those of the Linguistic Survey, as the word forms given in the former seem to show better preservation, *p* (Dundas' *ph*), for instance, appearing for *f* of the LSI. (and Endle's "Hills Kachari" forms in his *Grammar*, ii *et seqq.*).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Avery, PAOS., May, 1887, p. clviii (in JAOS., xiii (1889)).

<sup>3</sup> Nasalization of the final is a feature of Dìmâ-sâ as against Bârâ and Gârô. As additional examples are : Dìm. *manñ*, Bâ. *man*, Gârô *mân°* to find ; Dìm. *gain*, Bâ. *gan*, Gârô *gân* to wear ; Dìm. *gunñ*, Bâ. *gan-tañ*, Gârô *gin-trñ* nose.

The same tendency probably accounts for *gũ-run* to be loose, T. *agrol-ba*, P. *grol* to become free or loose, v. § 121.

Compare the reverse preference of Gârô for final *-l*, where related languages

lost from those languages, in which its elision may have been hastened by the following *n* of the Infinitive (Gârô *-nâ*, Bâŕâ *-nû*), which itself (with Infinitive *-mâ*) it does not possess. Consequently Gârô *ke(-nâ)*, Bâ. *gi(-nû)* to fear, in the light of Dîm. *kîn(-mâ)*, are really *ken(-nâ)* and *gin(-nû)*. Similarly Dîmâ-sâ has *daiñ* to cut, as against Gârô *de*, Bâ. *dâ*, and *den* to place, as against Gârô *do* (Bâ. *din-hû*).

Dîmsâ-sâ frequently has *s* where a related language will have a dental *d*, *t*, *ʈ*, or a palatal *ʃ*, *č*, *č̣*, giving such pairs as the following with Lhôtâ and Âo :—

Dîm. <i>ma-sao</i> , <i>ma-sâ</i>	Lh. <i>n-ʈe(-č̣i)</i>	Âo ( <i>me-so</i> ) to awaken.
<i>mî-sî</i>		<i>me-tû</i> to steep, to soak.
<i>si-ni</i>	<i>tî-in</i>	<i>te-net</i> seven.
<i>su-gu</i>	<i>tô-ku</i>	<i>ta-ko</i> nine.
<i>saiñ</i>	<i>čôn</i>	to want.
<i>si</i>	<i>n-č̣i</i>	to become wet.

The regular interchange in this language between *i* in the Hills dialect and *u* in the Plains, gives us pairs, such as in some few instances, we find in Tibetan. For there, where *i* and *u* are the most constant vowels (that is, occur generally <sup>1</sup> without variation in all four roots in verbs, *v.* § 21) they are frequently contrasted in a similar manner, as in e.g. *šib-pa* and *šub-pa*, P. and Imp. *šubs* to whisper, *abig(s)-pa*, P. *pig*s, F. *dbig*, Imp. *pig(s)* and *abug(s)-pa*, P. *pug*, F. *dbug*, Imp. *pug* to sting, to pierce, to bore, *abib(s)-pa*, and *abub(s)-pa*, P. and Imp. *púb(s)*, F. *dbub* to put on a roof, *šbid-pa* (Ts.) and *šbud-pa* bellows, *dbygig-pa* and *dbyug-pa* stick, *žim-bu* and *žum-bu* cat (CT.), *aŕi-ba* and *ažu-ba* flea, *sgrib-pa*, P. *bsgribs*, F. *bsgrib*, Imp. *sgrib(s)* > WT. *rib-č̣e* and *rub-pa* to darken, to obscure.

Between Burmese<sup>2</sup> and Tibetan we have: B. *nip* to be kept down, *nip* to press or crush down, T. *nub-pa* to fall gradually, to sink, *snub-pa*, P. *bsnubs*, F. *bsnub*, Imp. *snub(s)*, to suppress, to crush down; while between Kachin and Tibetan we find among others: K. *byin* to happen, to come have *-ñ* or *-n* (§ 127), and the fate of final *-l* in Mikir, where *i* has replaced it. So in M. *pi-rui*, formerly *pu-rul* snake (T. *sbrul*); *in-hoi* to do, formerly *in-hol*; and others (see Stack and Lyall, *The Mikirs*, pp. 174–5). Notice also Dîm. *dân*, Gârô *dâk* to do. Sometimes, however, the Plains dialect will share the nasalization with Dîmâ-sâ, as in: Dîm. *ga-sain*, Bâ. *ga-zân*, Gârô *kâ-sin-â* cold.

<sup>1</sup> See, however, § 56 (p. 65, *-ñ* <> *-n*).

<sup>2</sup> On the possible standing of Burmese *im* (Meithei *im*, *yum*) to Tibetan *kyim* house, see Laufer, *Si-Hia*, pp. 47–8. In these possibly compound forms (*gi-yim*, *gi-yum*) of T. *kyim*, Bunan *gyum*, Lepcha *kyüm*, Abor *e-kum*, we have the *i*:*u* variation.

about, T. *abyun-ba*, P. and Imp. *byun*; K. *rim* to be dusk, *n-rum* evening, twilight, T. *rum* darkness, obscurity; K. *čup* to absorb, to suck up, T. *aʃib(s)-pa*, P. *bʒibs (gʒibs)*, F. *bʒib (gʒib)*.

Between Kachin and Burmese again we have: K. *ša-grit* to lower, to humble, to decrease (from *grit* to be decreased or diminished), Bur. *ʃut* to put down (from *yut* to be inferior or mean).

It is possible that in some of these cases the vowel colouring is intended to register intensity of state or action (cf. § 102). The back vowel *u* in T. *rum* or *šub-pa*, for instance, is better adapted with its heavier and darker colouring to express the ideas of darkness and suppression conveyed by these two words.

In this connection it is of interest that Hanson (*K. Dic.* 53) specifically notes that of the two Kachin forms, *in* and *un* to become full (as a lake), *un* is sometimes regarded as the stronger word of the two.

Lushei shows several instances of this. Thus with *kál* to go, *buk-buk* is added as a descriptive particle when the action is that of a big heavy man, *bak-bak* when he is of medium-size, *bik-bek* if of small stature.<sup>1</sup>

By analogy *-á* is the suffix of masculine, *-i* of feminine proper nouns,<sup>2</sup> while as applied to direction we have *kú* or *kú-kú* that down there, as against *kí* or *kí-kí* that up there.<sup>3</sup>

## PERSONAL PRONOUNS

### § 118.

Independent	Possessive (= Gen. in <i>-nî</i> )
	Singular
1. <i>añ</i>	<i>a-nî</i>
2. <i>nuñ</i>	<i>nuñ-nî</i> ; <i>nî-nî</i>
3. <i>bô</i>	<i>bô-nî</i>
	Plural
1. <i>ʃiñ</i> ; <i>ʃuñ</i> ; <i>ʃi-nî-šî</i>	<i>ʃi-nî</i> , <i>ʃi-nî-šî-nî</i>
2. <i>nî-šî</i> , <i>nu-šî</i>	<i>nî-nî-šî-nî</i> ; <i>nî-šî-nî</i>
3. <i>bô-nî-šî</i> , <i>bô-n-šî</i>	<i>bô-nî-šî-nî</i>

The 3rd personal element *bô* is a demonstrative root (v. § 119) replacing the old guttural element, once independent, dealt with in § 121.

The plurals in *-nî-šî* are probably built upon a dual in *-nî* (from *gî-nî* two), *-šî* possibly being the same as Lh. *-te*, *-tê*.<sup>4</sup> The plural form *bô-n-šî* corresponds very well with Lh. *ô-n-te* (loc. cit.), and accords with the equivalence of Dim. *bô* and Lh. *ô* (v. § 148).

<sup>1</sup> Shakespear, *The Lushei Kuki Clans*, pp. 122-3.

<sup>2</sup> LSI., iii, 3, p. 131.

<sup>3</sup> LSI., iii, 3, p. 132.

<sup>4</sup> See §§ 117, 148. The substitution of *š* for *t* or *ʈ* is frequent, as again in, for instance, Dimâ-sâ (of Cachar) *ša-lai* tongue, Dimâ-sâ (Hojai of Nowgong) *šá-lai*, Gârô (Rugâ) *te-lai*, transposed from *\*le-čé* (T. *l-čé*).

## DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

§ 119. Simple root form.	Singular	Possessive	Plural
ê ; î ; bô	ê-bô (Hills dialect) î-bô (Plains dialect) “ this ”	ê-bô-nî î-bô-nî	ê-bô-nî-šî î-bô-nî-šî
ô ; bô	ô-bô “ that ” (near at hand)	ô-bô-nî	ô-bô-nî-šî

## THE VERB

(a) *Elements Standing before the Root*1. *ma-, mî-, mǝ-, mü-* of Series 0

§ 120. The varying forms of this prefix are due to vowel harmony with the following root, as appears from the following examples, beside which the cognate forms from *Âo* and *Lhôtâ* are added :—

Dîm.	Âo	Lh.
<i>ma-gaiñ</i> to be cold ; cold.	<i>te-mo-koñ</i> <i>mo-koñ-mo-koñ-er</i>	<i>n-kôn</i>
<i>ma-sao, ma-sâ</i> to awaken, to arouse.	<i>me-so</i>	<i>n-tē-čî</i>
<i>ma-dao</i> to itch.	<i>me-sâk</i>	<i>e-n-tâk</i>
<i>ma-tî, mî-tî</i> to know.	<i>me-tet</i>	<i>n-tsî</i>
<i>ma-jañ, ma-jaiñ</i> to be good or beautiful. <sup>1</sup>		<i>m-hôm, m-hôn</i>
<i>mî-nî</i> to laugh	<i>me-na</i>	
<i>mǝ-sî</i> to steep, to soak.	<i>me-tâ</i>	
<i>mǝ-lô</i> <sup>2</sup> to swallow.	<i>me-yok</i>	<i>n-zâ</i>

Cross relationships to Tibetan *b-*, *q-* occur in :—

Dîm.	L.
<i>ma-jañ-bâ, ma-jaiñ-bâ</i> beautiful, nice, good.	<i>bzañ-ba.</i>
<i>ma-sao</i> to digest, to dis- integrate. ( <i>sao</i> to decay.)	<i>añu-ba</i> , P. <i>bžus</i> , F. <i>bžu</i> to melt, to digest (tr. and intr.). <i>žun-pa</i> adj. melted. <sup>3</sup>
<i>ma-tî, mî-tî</i> to know, to understand.	<i>bšes-pa, šes-pa.</i>
<i>mǝ-lún</i> to lever or prize up. ( <i>lún</i> to dig or root up.)	<i>abru-ba, adru-ba</i> , P. and Imp. <i>brus, drus</i> to dig, carve, or cut (> L. <i>du, dun</i> id.). (Cf. ? <i>druñs</i> root (rare).)

<sup>1</sup> In *ma-jañ-bâ, ma-jaiñ-bâ* adj. nice, beautiful.

<sup>2</sup> For the prefix compare also *Dailâ m-ne.*

<sup>3</sup> See § 55.

Cross relationships to *Äo á-* occur in :—

Dîm.	Äo.
<i>ma-ŷân, ma-ŷain</i> to be good or beautiful. <sup>1</sup>	<i>á-zuñ</i> id. ( <i>te-á-zuñ</i> adj. good, beautiful).

## 2. *ga-, gě-, gĩ-, gǒ-, gũ-* of Series I

§ 121. The varying vocalizations of this old verbal noun derivative (adjectival) prefix here represent vowel harmony forms, and may be illustrated in the following examples :—

<i>ga-kâ</i> bitter.	<i>gě-señ</i> sparse, thin.
<i>gĩ-bim</i> dense, thick.	<i>gǒ-soñ</i> steep.
<i>gũ-sum</i> black.	<i>gũ-pû</i> white.

Usually it appears in this manner before the plain root, but more rarely occurs before a root with a suffix *-bâ* or *-bĩ*, relative participle formatives (§ 105), as in—

<i>gě-dê-bâ</i> great.	<i>ga-sain-bĩ</i> cold.
------------------------	-------------------------

In rare cases what is usually written as a prefix is really the root initial, as occurs in *gũ-run-bâ, gũ-run-bĩ* (properly *gruñ-bâ, gruñ-bĩ*) loose, from \**gruñ* to be loose, a root related to Tibetan *agrol-ba*, P. *grol* to be loose (v. § 117, n. 3).

## 3. The Causative Prefix. *pá-, pũ-*

§ 122. The causative element is *pũ-, pá-*, as in *pũ-nû* to cause to see, to show (from *nû* to see); *pá-rain* to dry, to spread out to dry (from *rain* to become dry, to be parched); *pá-rao* to lock, to fasten up (from *rao-bâ* adj. hard, firm).

### (b) Elements Standing after the Root

#### 1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 123. Among these we have :—

*-târ-* with completive force = adv. wholly, altogether, completely (= Bâ. *-tra-*, § 114).

*gâm* to be finished, *gâm-târ-* to be completely finished.

*pai* to spend, *pai-târ-* to spend completely (as money).

*-kĩ-rip-* of totality = adv. all, every, whole (Plains *kũ-rub*).

*dain* to cut, *dain-kĩ-rip-* to massacre, to kill everyone.

*-pĩn-* of repetition = adv. again (= Bâ. *-fin-*, § 114; Gârô *-pil-*, § 131).

*pai* to come, *pai-pĩn-* to come back, to return.

*nû* to see, *nû-pĩn-* to see again.

<sup>1</sup> In *ma-ŷân-bâ, ma-ŷain-bâ*, adj. nice, beautiful.

## 2. Directive Infixes

§ 124. With directive value are :—

-*señ*- carrying the force of “in, into”, perhaps from *bi-siñ* adv. within.

*nê* to push, *nê-señ*- to push in, to thrust in.

*lû* to pour, *lû-señ*- to pour in, to pour into.

*dô* to strike, *dô-señ*- to drive in (a nail).

-*hon*-, -*hon-hâ*- indicating motion “out”.

*nê* to push, to thrust, *nê-hon*-, *nê-hon-hâ*- to eject, to throw out.

-*kû*-, -*kê*- indicating motion “upwards”.

*gâ* or *gâ-kû*- to mount, to climb, to ascend.

*nê* to push, *nê-kê*- to tip, to push up.

More doubtful, as they probably go back to verb roots, and then do not properly belong here, are :—

-*lân*- of motion = “away, out, forth, from,” probably from *lân* to take away, to remove (= Bâ. -*lân*-, § 114, *q.v.*).

*kai* to run, *kai-lân*- to run away.

This is probably not a particle of completeness or intensification as Endle suggests for Bâṛa (*v.* § 114). Its basic sense of removal frequently gives it the force of “passing by”, as, for instance, in : *lai-lân*- to overtake and pass by. Its probable verbal nature comes out more clearly in such instances.

-*bû*- indicates “motion towards the speaker” (= Bâ. -*bô*-, § 114, Gârô -*bâ*-, § 132, *q.v.*).

*lâ-bû*- to bring, to convey, to fetch (= Gârô *râ-bâ*-).

3. The Causative Infix -*rî*-

§ 125. This element is the verb *rî* to give, and is probably a younger construction than *pû*-, *pâ*- (§ 122). It is exemplified in *ĵî-rî* to cause to eat, to feed, from *ĵî* to eat.

## THE SUBSTANTIVE

*Elements Standing before the Root*

*ba*-, *bě*-, *bĩ*-, *bô*-, *bũ*- of Series II

§ 126. Before a certain number of parts of the body *ba*-, *bě*-, *bĩ*-, *bô*-, *bũ*- (vowel harmony forms) occur, and correspond to Lhôtâ ô- (§ 157 *q.v.*).



*ba-gá-rân* (also *gá-rân*) throat.

*bě-ge-reñ* bone.

*ba-haiñ* flesh, meat.

(*haiñ* = relative, kindred, "flesh.")

*bǎ-ṭlīm*, *bǎ-ṭluñ* brains.

*bǒ-sro* lungs.

*bǎ-gur* skin (general term).

This prefix is more elastic than the generic prefixes *sao-* (for human beings), *mi-* (for animals), and is evidently the demonstrative root "that" (really genitive "its"). (v. § 118 *sup.*) Thus *sao-gur* is "human skin", *mi-gur* "animal skin, hide", but *bǎ-gur* skin, lit. its skin (either human or animal).

The correspondence of this element again with Lhôtâ ô-, is clear with family relationships, where they parallel each other.

In Dîmâ-sâ we have :—

*bô-pá*, *bú-pá*<sup>1</sup> father.

*bô-mâ*, *bú-mâ* mother.

*ba-dâ* elder brother, or cousin.

*bǐ-bǐ*, *bǎ-bǐ* elder sister.

*bǎ-pi-yuñ* younger brother, or cousin.

*bá-hán-dao* younger sister.

*bá-ṣân* younger brother (when very young).

*bǎ-ṣû* grandfather.

*bǐ-dǐ* paternal uncle.

*ba-bá-ṣû* grandmother.

*ba-sai* husband.

*bě-dê* maternal uncle.

*bǐ-hǐ* wife.

and others.

## GÂRÔ

### Preliminary

§ 127. Some of its characteristics stamp this language as being one of the oldest of its group. Playfair<sup>2</sup> is inclined to regard it as the "primitive" form as against Kachari.

It is worthy of note here that in some archaic chants, now imperfectly understood, the prefix *gi-* is less intimately connected with adjectival roots than in the later language. It would be invaluable to have more of these old songs for study, as we probably have here a stratum of language older than anything now found elsewhere in the Bodo group, since even in the modern colloquial, Gârô shows signs of age.

Thus, as against Bârâ. it often preserves prefixes : Gârô *gni*, Bâ. *ne* (*nǎi*) two ; Gârô *gi-tām*, Bâ. *tām* three ; while we find the same thing with finals : Gârô *nik*, Bâ. *nǎ* to see ;

<sup>1</sup> Compare LSI., iii, 2, pp. 58 and 63, where the pronominal nature of the prefix in this instance is recognized.

<sup>2</sup> *The Garos*, p. 157.

Gârô *sák*, Bâ. *sá* classifier before numerals with human beings ; Gârô *mân*, Bâ. *má* id. with animals ; Gârô *nok*, Bâ. *nũ* house ; Gârô *dok*, Bâ. *ḍă* (*ră*) six.

It stands in the same relation to Dîmâ-sâ in many cases : Gârô *sok*, Dîm. *sô* to reach, to arrive at ; Gârô *nik*, Dîm. *nũ* ; *nai* to see ; Gârô *nok*, Dîm. *nô* house ; Gârô *dok*, Dîm. *dô* six , Gârô *sák*, Dîm. *sao* classifier with human beings ; Gârô *mân*, Dîm. *má* id. with animals.

Otherwise the facts do not entirely bear out Playfair's statement, and Hills Kachari or Dîmâ-sâ (*q.v.*) stands as older than Gârô.

An important point of agreement between these two last, however, is in the vocalization of certain words where Gârô and Dîmâ-sâ "in the hills" (*v. Dundas, Gr. passim.*) have *i* against *u* of Dîmâ-sâ "in the plains".

Thus we find : Gârô and Dîm. (H.) *rim*, Dîm. (P.) *rum* to catch ; Gârô and Dîm. (H.) *siñ*, Dîm. (P.) *suñ* to inquire ; Gârô *gi-pin*, Dîm. (H.) *gî-bin*, Dîm. (P.) *gĩ-bun* another ; Gârô *riñ*, Dîm. (H.) *liñ*, Dîm. (P.) *lui* to drink ; Gârô *min*, Dîm. (H.) *gĩ-min*, Dîm. (P.) *gĩ-mun* ripe ; Gârô *s-rip*, Dîm. (H.) *gĩ-lĩb*, Dîm. (P.) *gĩ-lub* to drown ; Gârô *bĩl*, Dîm. (H.) *bĩr*, Dîm. (P.) *bur* to fly ; and others.

A distinctive feature of the language is the replacement of final *n* or *n* by *l*.<sup>1</sup> Thus :—

Gârô (Standard) *bâl*, Dîm. *bon*, Bâ. *ban* wood, tree ; Âtong  
Gârô, Râbhâ, Kôch *pan*, Gârô (Rugâ) *pa-pañ*, Dîm.  
*bo-pân*, *bu-pân* tree.

Gârô (Standard) *sâl* (Tipurâ *šâl*), Bâ. *sân*, Dîm. *saiñ*, Kôch  
*ra-san*, Gârô (Rugâ) *ra-san-a* sun.

Gârô (Standard) *pil*, Dîm. *pĩn*, Bâ. *fin* again.

<sup>1</sup> The same interchange is in evidence in T. *san-ba* and *sel-ba* (P. and F. *bsal*) to remove, to clean, *sriñ* and *sriñ* silk-worm.

In Thâdo *a-sel*, Lushei *a-hel* as against T. *rjen(-pa)* raw, unripe, and in Meithei *a-hal* as against T. *rgan(-pa)* the same substitution occurs.

The change is probably in the opposite sense in : T. *adril-ba*, P. *dril* (for (?) : *agrul-ba*, P. *gril*) to be turned or rolled round, or cylindrical, K. *ta-rin* to be rolled round (as between the fingers) ; T. *qĩral-ba*, P. *ĩral*, F. *ĩral*, Imp. *ĩrol* to separate (vb. tr.), *abral-ba*, P. *bral*. Imp. *bröl* to be separated (vb. intr.), K. *pa-ran* to separate (vb. tr.), *ka-ran* to divide, to distribute (vb. tr.), *ran* to be separated (vb. intr.).

Compare the rendering of the Chinese *fan-tsie* final *t* (> eighth cent. 8), as *l* in Sino-Korean, and as *r* in Tibetan and Uigur transcriptions ; also the employment of Chinese words with final *t* for words with final *r* in Sogdian, Pahlavi, and Sanskrit. See especially : Maspero, *Le Dialecte de Tch'ang-ngan sous les T'ang*, BEFEO, t. xx (1920), No. 2, pp. 41-2. Compare also Simon, *Zur Rekonstruktion der alchinesischen Endkonsonanten*, pp. 5-6.

Gârô (Standard) *dâl-°á* big, Gârô (Âtong), Râbhâ *čun-á*, T. *čen-po*.<sup>1</sup>

Gârô (Standard) *čel-á* (Lâlung *čál-a*, Tipurâ *k<sup>a</sup>-čál*), Bâ. *ga-zân*, Hojai *ke-žen*, Dîm. *gă-žaiñ*, *žaiñ-bî* (*žaiñ-bi* acc. Anderson, LSI. iii, 2, p. 4 q.v.) far.

Gârô *pâl*, Bâ. *făn* Dîm. *paiñ* to sell.

Gârô *sâl*, Dîm. *saiñ* to pull, to draw.

## PERSONAL PRONOUNS

### § 128.

Independent		Possessive (= Gen. in - <i>nî</i> )	
		Singular	
1st p.	<i>ân-á</i>		<i>ân-nî</i>
2nd p.	<i>nâ°-á</i>		<i>nân-nî</i>
3rd p.	<i>ú-á</i>		<i>ú-nî</i> ; <i>ú-á-nî</i>
		Plural	
1st p.	<i>čin-á</i> (exclusive)		<i>čin-nî</i>
	<i>ân°-čin-á</i> <i>á°-čin-á</i> <i>nâ°-čin-á</i>	(inclusive) <sup>2</sup>	
2nd p.	<i>nâ°-si-mân</i>		<i>nâ°-si-mân-nî</i>
3rd p.	<i>ú-á-mân</i> <i>ú-á-má°-dân</i> <i>ú-á-rân</i> <i>ú-á-drân</i>	(usually with intelligent beings) (usually with things)	
			<i>ú-á-mân-nî</i>

The 3rd personal element *ú-á* is the demonstrative root *ú* (§ 129), replacing the older element *gi-* (§ 130) once independent.

## DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

### § 129.

Simple root

form	Singular	Possessive	Plural
<i>î</i>	<i>î-á</i> this	<i>î-á-nî</i> <i>î-nî</i>	<i>î-á-mân</i> ; <i>î-á-má°-dân</i> <i>î-á-rân</i> ; <i>î-á-drân</i>
<i>ú</i>	<i>ú-á</i> that	<i>ú-á-nî</i> <i>ú-nî</i>	<i>ú-á-mân</i> ; <i>ú-á-má°-dân</i> <i>ú-á-rân</i> ; <i>ú-rân</i> ; <i>ú-á-drân</i>

<sup>1</sup> This, for older *dan* or *d'an*? (v. Karlgren, *Phonologie*, 566; *Dic.*, No. 952: 大 *d'ái'*, *tái'*). Cf. also § 55 and (for Gârô-á <> T. -*ba* -*pa*) § 130, n. 5. Whether Chinese gives us evidence in such cases that Tibetan palatals go back to pure dentals (cf. also T. *šin* field, Chinese 田 \* *d'ien*, Karlgren, *Dic.*, No. 998, and *Phonologie*, p. 533), or whether Chinese early hardened its palatals into pure dentals, as the southern Tibeto-Burman languages of Assam and Burma are now doing as against Tibetan, is a question which the writer does not feel qualified to answer.

<sup>2</sup> For *nâ°-á-čin-á* "thou-we", a form still in use, v. LSI., iii, 2, p. 72.

*û* probably = Bârâ *boi* (§ 110) Dîmâ-sâ *bô* (§ 119), which thus indicate \**bu* or \**bo* as its original form.<sup>1</sup> Lhôtâ *ô-* is likewise probably the same element (*v.* § 148). Compare also the table, § 104. The same loss of a labial initial occurs in e.g. *ok* belly, for older *pok*, *puk* as in Âtong *pî-puk* (*cf.* § 135).

## THE VERB

### (a) Elements standing before the Root

#### *gi-* of Series I

§ 130. This prefix is not of very frequent occurrence here, occurring with only a limited number of de-verbal derivatives such as the following:—

<i>gi-pok</i> , <i>gi-pu</i> white	<i>gi-tân</i> green, raw, unripe.
<i>gi-ŋip</i> fan <sup>2</sup>	<i>gi-pin</i> another <sup>3</sup>

It is probable that this same element is present in the compound suffix *-gi-pâ*<sup>4</sup> equivalent in meaning to “the one who”, used to change verbs into substantives, as, for instance, *dok-gi-pâ* the one who strikes, from *dok* to strike, *kâ°-sâ-gi-pâ* the one who loves, from *kâ°-sâ* to love.

*gi-* is evidently here an infix placed between the verb root and *-pâ*,<sup>5</sup> and its use in this manner is most likely the reason for its very limited employment as a prefix. Gârô replaces such constructions as e.g. Dîmâ-sâ *bo-pân gũ-ŋû*, or *bo-pân ŋû-bâ* (§ 105) the high tree, with *bâl cû-gi-pâ* (*v.* § 106).

The lack of this prefix before adjectives which in the later language possess it, in the archaic diction of certain poetic compositions recorded by Playfair<sup>6</sup> is important here, as it may indicate the possibility of

<sup>1</sup> Avery's Hills Kachari *bwa* “that” (PAOS., May, 1887, p. clx) is evidently an intermediate form. Likewise *eb*, which he gives for HK. “this”, is properly *e-b* for earlier *ê-bô* (*v.* § 119).

<sup>2</sup> This would agree with Dîmâ-sâ *gi-sip* fan (from *sip* to blow (*intr.*), to fan (*tr.*)), though Tibetan *gyab-mo*, *yab-mo* the act of fanning, fan, raises the possibility that in both Gârô and Dîmâ-sâ the prefix is a survival of Tibetan *g-*.

<sup>3</sup> Dîmâ-sâ *gĩ-bin* (Hills), *gũ-bun* (Plains), from *pin* again.

<sup>4</sup> The compound form *-gâ-bâ* of the Âtong dialect approaches more closely than Gârô *-gi-pâ* to other Bodo forms in the matter of vocalization.

<sup>5</sup> This is probably unrelated to the Tibetan suffix *-pa*, *-ba* the one who (*v.* §§ 105, 106), the more immediate relative of which appears to be Gârô *-â*, the Infinitive particle, examples of direct correspondence between which and Tibetan *-ba*, *-pa*, are:—

<i>si-â</i> to die	T. <i>aĩ-ba</i> , <i>ñi-ba</i> .
<i>čô-â</i> to dig	<i>rko-ba</i> , P. ( <i>h</i> ) <i>rkos</i> , F. <i>brko</i> , Imp. <i>rkos</i> .
<i>rû-â</i> to pour	<i>ldugs-pa</i> (col. <i>blug-pa</i> ), P. <i>ldugs</i> , <i>blugs</i> , F. <i>blug</i> , Imp. <i>blug(s)</i> .

<sup>6</sup> *The Garos*, pp. 128–35; 140–44.

discovering traces of the independent pronoun in *g* (*k*), and thus further connecting the language in fundamental characteristics more closely with Tibetan.

In these texts, *gi-pu*, *gi-pok* white (Bâ. *ga-fút*, Dîm. *gǎ-pú*, Tipurâ *kū-fur*), appears without its pronominal prefix. As against modern : *wák cân gi-pok* a white-sided pig (*op. cit.*, pp. 120, 136), or, *wák cân gi-pu* a white-backed pig (*id.*, 122), this archaic language uses *bok : mî-roñ bok-dân-kô rá°-ná-ʃok* to bring (thee) white rice (*id.*, 134); *ʃá-piñ gim-bá-ri bok-gin* (thy) thigh is white as the gimbari tree (*id.*, 135).

## (b) Elements Standing after the Root

### 1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 131. These are numerous. Among others are :—

-*srân-* of entirety = “altogether, entirely” (cf. Bâ. -*srâ-*, above, in § 114).

*bál-wá ân-nî nok-kô pe°-srân-á-há* The wind entirely broke down (*pe°* . . . . . -*á-há*) my house.

-*tok-* of totality = “all”.

*û-ô-mân rê°-bá-pil-tok-á-há* They all came (*rê°* . . . . -*á-há*) back (-*bá-*, v. § 132) again (-*pil-*).

-*tai-* of repetition = “again” (cf. Êmpêo -*dai-*, § 178).

*dák-tui-ʃá-wá* (He) will not do (*dák-* . . . -*ʃá-wá*) (it) again.

*rê°-ân-tai-á-há* (They) went away again.

-*pil*<sup>1</sup> of repetition = “again, back” (cf. Dîm. and Bâ. -*pîn-* and -*fin-*, §§ 123, 114).

*gi-sik rá°-pil-c* Thinking it over again (lit. Taking his mind again).

*dok-ʃá-pil-á* (He) does not strike back again.

-*bê-*, intensive = “much, many, exceedingly” (cf. ? Bâ. -*bai-*, § 114).

*sik-bê-á-çim* (He) wished exceedingly.<sup>2</sup>

*kū-dim-bê-á-há* (He) kissed him repeatedly.<sup>3</sup>

-*á-ri-* of limited action, indicates the verbal act as the only one, or, at least, the first one, to be accomplished. = “Only, simply”; “immediately, at once.”

*á°-bá-çi rê°-ân-á-ri-á-há* (She) went away immediately to the field.

<sup>1</sup> I take this element here, although it is probably a verb root “to turn” (v. Phillips, *Gr.* 18), as it shows how easily these infixes grow out of such roots. Indeed, in the two usages they function together in, for instance, *á-á dō°-kru pil-pil-ʃá-há* She did not again (-*pil-*) turn (*pil-*) into a dove (Playfair, *The Garos*, p. 125). That Bâ. -*fin-* and Dîm. -*pîn-* are the same element is almost a certainty. Gârô final -*l* for Bâ. and Dîm. -*n* (or -*n̄*) is common. See § 127 *sup.* (Notice, however, Gârô *gi-pin* another, and its cognates in § 130.) Is there any connection here with Tibetan *pyi-r* again?

<sup>2</sup> LSI., iii, 2, p. 75.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

**-sô-** of priority = “before, first”.

*ân-â û-â-mân-kô nîk-sô-â-hâ* I saw (*nîk-* . . . . . -*â-hâ*) them first (i.e. before they arrived).

**-grik-** of reciprocity, appears to be equivalent to “each other, one another” or “together, in company”.

*û-â-mân nâm-grik-â-hâ* They became reconciled (lit. good (*nâm*)) together.

This particle is perhaps comparable to Dîm. *lu-gu*, Bâ. *lu-gû-sê* “together, as companions”.<sup>1</sup> There is also a strange resemblance to T. *grogs* (vulg. *rogs*) friend, associate, companion (from *agrogs-pu* to be associated).

**-bre-**, used only with the negative verb, and carrying in the resultant compound form *-bre-ǰâ-* the sense of “hardly, scarcely, not very well” is probably itself an adverb “nearly, almost” (cf. Dîm. *bâ-lai* id.).

*ân-nî â-gân-â-kô ui-bre-ǰâ-ô-de, sin°-tai-bô* If you do not very well understand what I say, ask again.

*mân°-bre-ǰâ-řim* (He) was hardly able; could hardly do.

## 2. Directive Infixes

§ 132. Infixes with directive vale standing after the verb are fairly conspicuous. Amongst them we find:—

**-skâ-**, which appears to have a transitive force directing the verbal action “to another” (c. Phillips, *Gr.* 18).

*on°-ǰâ-skâ-en-â* (He) is not giving (to another) (id.).

**-ân-** indicating motion “away from” (cf. Bâ. and Dîm. *-lân-*).

*rê°-ân-ê* going away; *řim-ân-bô* take (or lead) (him) away.

*sâl rê°-ân-ǰok* The sun has set (lit. The sun has gone away).

More doubtful is—

**-bâ-** often indicating “direction towards the speaker”, but probably originally from an adv. “back”, or possibly “again”. Thus, though we have e.g. *rê°-bâ-tok-en-â* They are all coming (here) (Phillips, *Gr.*, 23), its original force is probably more clearly seen in e.g. *û-â . . . . . â°-tân pâ-ô-nâ rê°-bâ-ǰok* He came back again to his father (Playfair, *The Garos*, 75). At all events *-bâ-* is often a purely descriptive adverbial element and belongs in this capacity under § 131.

<sup>1</sup> For the vowel, see § 127.

### 3. The Causative Infix -ât-

§ 133. The causative infix following the verb is -ât- (= vb. tr. to give) as in e.g. *dok-ât-* to cause to strike, from *dok* to strike, to beat.

#### THE SUBSTANTIVE

##### *Elements Standing before the Root*

§ 134. Gârô lacks pronominal prefixes here. Its only prefixed element, non-pronominal *â-*, is dealt with in § 103.

### B. CENTRAL NÂGÂ LANGUAGES

#### *Preliminary*

§ 135. One of the most characteristic features of these languages is their lack of the guttural demonstrative or 3rd personal prefix *ka-* or *ga-* belonging in Series I, and its replacement in Âo by *te-* (Tibetan *de*). The occurrence of a 1st personal element *ka-*, *ke-*, *k-* (probably = T. *ko*, v. § 100), explains its absence here by conflict.

In this group the labial initials *b*, *p*, *p*<sup>1</sup> tend to drop out. This is most marked in Âo, where we have :—

Âo	T.
<i>â-eim</i> to be poor.	<i>apôns-pa</i> , etc., id.
<i>â-eim</i> to vanquish.	<i>apâm-pa</i> , etc., to be conquered.
<i>â-ei(-dok)</i> to wipe.	<i>apÿi-ba</i> , <i>apÿid-pa</i> id.; <i>abyi-ba</i> , etc., to be wiped off or blotted out. <sup>2</sup>
<i>â-ein</i> to drive away.	<i>abyin-pa</i> , etc., id.
<i>â-lem</i> , <i>lem(-zak)</i> <sup>3</sup> to apportion.	<i>abrim-pa</i> , P. <i>brim(s)</i> to distribute, to deal out, to hand out.
<i>â-lem(-dân)</i> to distribute.	
<i>râ(-dân)</i> to part, to divide.	<i>abral-ba</i> , P. <i>bral</i> , Imp. <i>bröl</i> to be separated, to be parted.
<i>râ(-ši)</i> to separate.	<i>apral-ba</i> , P. <i>pral</i> , F. <i>dbral</i> , Imp. <i>prol</i> to separate, to part (tr.).

<sup>1</sup> Compare the conflict between labial prefix and dental initial indicated in Âo *âm* to seize, to grasp, T. *afam-pa*, P. *afams* (< \**ba-tam*).

<sup>2</sup> In *niel(-tâ)*, or, perhaps better, *niel(-â-lâ)* in agreement with T. *apÿid-pa*, Lhôtâ seems to preserve the initial as *n*.

<sup>3</sup> See, however, § 139 *inf*.

Lhôtâ seems to hold an intermediate position in this particular, sometimes preserving the labial as *v* or *w*. Thus :—

Âo *â-on*, *â-en*, *â-in* to blow (of the wind). Lh. *vên*.

Âo *â-o* to go. Lh. *wô*, *wâ*. See § 139 in *extr.*

On the other hand, in—

Âo *â-en*, *â-on* to throw, Lh. *m-pen* to throw over the shoulder,

T. *apên-pa*, etc., to throw, to fling (v. § 419), Lhôtâ aligns itself more definitely with Tibetan.

Compare, also, where Âo has not entirely dropped the initial :—

Âo *â-wâ* to swim. T. *apyo-ba*, etc., id.

Âo *â-wâ(-tsa)* to save. Lh. *wâ(-tâ)*; *wâ* id. (cf. ? T. *pân-ba*, *pâns* (also *pôns*, prov.)).

## ÂO NÂGÂ

### PERSONAL PRONOUNS

#### § 136.

Independent	Possessive (Special Forms)
	Singular
1st p. <i>ni</i>	<i>ka-</i> , <i>ke-</i> , <i>k-</i> } Also in other
2nd p. <i>nâ</i>	<i>ne-</i> } oblique cases.
3rd p. <i>pâ</i>	<i>(pâ)</i>
	Plural
1st p. <i>ô-zô</i> , <i>ô-zô-nok</i> , <i>ô-nok</i> , <i>â-sen</i> , <i>â-se-nok</i>	<i>ô-</i> , ( <i>ô-zô</i> , etc.)
2nd p. <i>ne-nok</i>	<i>ne-</i> , ( <i>ne-nok</i> )
3rd p. <i>pâ-re-nok</i> , <i>pâ-re</i>	<i>(pâ-re-nok)</i>

The possessive forms in brackets are late. *pâ* is a demonstrative element replacing older *te-* (§ 140), itself once independent.

For *ka-*, *ke-*, *k-* and their relation to Tibetan *kô(-bo, -mo)* of the 1st person, see § 100.

Clark has suggested that the plural suffix *-nok* may be the same as *lok* multitude, but in face of the Lhôtâ suffix *-nô* (§§ 147–48) and the cognates suggested in § 141, this seems doubtful. Is it possible that *-nog* in Hoernle MS. No. 143a, line 3, Reverse, which “evidently has the meaning of *rnam*s”<sup>1</sup> is the same element?

The oblique forms for the 1st and 2nd persons are now rare, but still occur in, for instance,<sup>2</sup> *ka-mu* my younger brother,

<sup>1</sup> Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, vol. 1, p. 404.

<sup>2</sup> See Clark, *Âo Naga Grammar*, p. 67.



*ke-me-č'i* my walking-stick, *k-in* my iron, and *ne-den* beside you (lit. of you, the being beside, from *á-ten* to accompany) for the singular. In the plural we have *ô-bá* our father, *ô-dí* our elder brother, etc.

Notwithstanding the fact that *Âo me-* of the 3rd person is almost certainly to be equated with Tibetan *m-*, and is consequently of much greater antiquity than the Kuki-Chin 3rd personal root,<sup>1</sup> the correspondence of the old *Âo* series of prefixes with that of the typical Kuki-Chin language may here be pointed out.

Âo 1st p. <i>ka-</i> , <i>ke-</i> , <i>k-</i>	Kuki-Chin <i>ka-</i> , <i>kê-</i> , <i>ká-</i>
2nd p. <i>ne-</i>	<i>nan-</i> , <i>ná-</i>
3rd p. <i>me</i> - <sup>2</sup>	<i>a-ma</i> , <i>ma-</i>

### DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

§ 137. These show much compounding with one another, and are as follows :—

	Simple Root Form	Plural	Root combined with other (suffixed) demonstratives
Standing as first elements.	“ This ” { <i>á-</i>	<i>á-tam</i>	<i>á-bá</i> , <i>á-zi</i> , <i>á-bá-zi</i> , <i>á-tú</i> ,
	{ <i>î-</i>	<i>î-bá-tam</i>	<i>á-tô</i>
	{ <i>ê-</i>		<i>î-bá</i> , <i>î-bá-zi</i>
Standing as second elements.	“ That ” { <i>pá-</i>	<i>pá-re</i>	
	{ <i>tá-</i>	<i>pá-re-nok</i>	
	(“ This ? ”)- <i>zi</i>		
	“ That ” { <i>-tô</i>		
	{ <i>-tú</i>		

The most frequently employed are *á-bá*, *î-bá* (with which compare Dîm. *î-bô*, *ê-bô* this, *ô-bô* that), *á-bá-zi*, *á-zi*, *î-bá-zi*. They are sometimes used as 3rd personal pronouns, particularly *î-bá* and *á-zi*.

The root *zi* is probably to be identified with *ŷi* true (Clark, *Gr.* 12), and is thus an emphatic particle, *á-zi* this very one, this one in truth, etc.

<sup>1</sup> v. §§ 188, 104.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. § 148 *inf.*

## THE VERB

(a) *Elements Standing before the Root*

Evidently belonging to the oldest stratum of the language, are the two inseparable prefixes *me-* and *â-*, which are always found next to the root.

1. *me-* of Series 0

§ 138. This prefix is evidently verbal, and is to be connected with Tibetan inseparable *m-*, being, like this latter, a subjective element.

With verbs *me-* is nearly always simple<sup>1</sup> and does not show vowel harmony with the following root, thus standing in contradistinction to *me-*, *mo-*, *mu-*, with substantives (§ 144).

It corresponds directly to Tibetan *m-* in :—

Âo

T.

*me-nem.**mnam-pa* to smell (intr.).

Rarely it is mistakenly written as a prefix, where Tibetan seems to show that it is really the root initial.

Thus in Âo *myim* (usually written *meim*) = T. *byams-pa* kindness, love, affection, *myim* is evidently for older *byim*, *byem*, *byam*. It is possible, however, that in Tibetan *byams* *b-* is a prefix, *y* the root initial. Cf. Lh. *n-zâ<sup>n</sup>*.

To Lhôtâ *m-*, *n-*, it is the regular equivalent. See § 149.

Cross relationships to the distinct element *b-*, *q-*, of Tibetan are frequent, and occur in :—

Âo

T.

*me-zak*, *me-nâk*.*ldag-pa*, P. *bldags*, F. *bldag*,  
Imp. *ldog* to lick.*me-yok.**agegs-pa*, P. *bkag*, F. *dgag*,  
Imp. *kog* to hinder.*akegs-pa*, P. *kegs* id.*agag-pa*, P. *agags* to stop, to  
cease (vb. intr.).(te-bân) *me-ĵem.*(ka) *adzum-pa*, P. *btsum*, *zum*,  
F. *gzum*, Imp. *tsum* to  
close (the mouth). (Cf.  
also *adzom(s)-pa* to meet,  
to join.)

<sup>1</sup> In the rare instances in which it occurs as *mâ-* I have not with certainty been able to analyse it. In *mâ-ren* (-*ši*) (= *me-â-ren* (-*ši*) to increase, from *â-ren* to increase), we perhaps have a compound: *me* through growing (*mei* to grow acc. Ck. *Gr.* 125) to increase (*â-ren*), while *mâ-eim* to defeat is probably: through blows (*mâ*; *â-mâ* = to strike) to be victorious (*â-eim*).

Âo	T.
<i>me-tsa, me-sza.</i>	<i>aťso-ba</i> , P. and Imp. <i>sos</i> to feed (vb. intr.). <i>aťso-ba</i> , P. ( <i>b</i> ) <i>sos</i> , F. <i>gso</i> to feed (vb. tr.).
<i>me-ták.</i>	<i>adzugs-pa, zug-pa</i> , P. <i>btsugs,</i> <i>zugs</i> , F. <i>gzugs</i> , Imp. <i>zug(s)</i> to sting.
<i>me-sep</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>aťib(s)-pa</i> , P. <i>bźibs (gźibs)</i> , F. <i>bźib (gźib)</i> to suck up, to absorb.
<i>me-tet.</i>	<i>bšes-pa, šes-pa</i> to know, to understand.

## 2. *â-* of Series 0

§ 139. This prefix, which appears almost exclusively with verb roots, is found in the great majority of cases in which *me-* does not occur, these two elements being mutually exclusive.

Judging from first appearances *â-* might seem to have some connection with time, and Clark<sup>2</sup> has called it an "augment" that can be dropped at will, suggesting from its apparent tendency to occur with past time, that it may be a prefix denoting past or completed action. This, however, is more apparent than real. In many verbs, as in *â-ru* it is never dropped, and in view of what will appear below (that it is basically related to Tibetan *b-*) any preference shown by *â-* for the Past tense is only what one might expect, as this is also a characteristic of Tibetan *b-* (v. §§ 15, 17–20 *sup.*).

From the number of instances in which Âo *â-* corresponds directly to Tibetan *b-*, *a-*, it seems almost certain that it must itself be traced back to a form *\*bâ-*, a reconstruction strongly supported by the frequent dropping of labial root initials *b*, *p*, *ɸ* in Âo (v. § 135 *sup.*), and the passage of the Tibetan suffix *-ba* into *-wa* or *-a* in the modern dialects. The supposed former vocalization of Tibetan *b-* as *\*bâ-* (*\*bâ-*) also here finds support. See, especially, § 29 *sup.*

In the following Âo *â-* is equivalent to Tibetan *b-*, *a-* :—

<sup>1</sup> v. § 149, n. 1 (p. 146).

<sup>2</sup> *Ao Naga Grammar*, p. 17.

## Âo

*â-so* to beget.*â-zañ*<sup>1</sup> to empty.*â-zoñ* to lift, to raise.*â-zuñ* to be good ; adj. good.*â-en*,<sup>2</sup> *â-on* to throw, to fling.*â-eim* to be poor.*â-eim* to vanquish.*â-ei(-dok)*<sup>3</sup> to wipe.*â-ein* to drive away.*â-wâ* to swim.*â-tâk* to weave.*â-tep*<sup>4</sup> to strike, to hit, to club.*â-tem*<sup>4</sup> to beat a drum.*â-tem*<sup>4</sup> to plant.

## T.

*bšo-ba*, P. *bšos*.*šon-ba*, P. *bšaṅs*, F. *bšaṅ*,Imp. *šon(s)*.*señ-ba*, P. *bsaṅs*, F. *bsaṅ*, *bseñ*.*bzañ-ba*.*ap̄en-pa*, P. *ap̄aṅs*, F. *ap̄aṅ*Imp. *p̄oñ*, *p̄aṅs*.*ap̄oṅs-pa*, P. *ap̄oṅs*, *p̄oṅs* id.*ap̄uñ-ba*, P. *p̄uñ* to be in declining circumstances, to fall into misery.*ap̄am-pa*, P. *p̄am* to be vanquished, to be beaten.*ap̄yi-ba*, *ap̄yid-pa*, P. *p̄yis*, *ap̄yis* to wipe, to blot out (tr.).*abyi-ba*, P. *byi* (also *p̄yi* and *p̄yis*) to be wiped off or blotted out (intr.).*abyin-pa*, P. and Imp. *p̄yūñ*, F. *dbyūñ*.*ap̄yo-ba*, P. *ap̄yos* (?) to swim (of fish).*aṭag-pa*, P. *btag*, F. *btag*, Imp. *fog*.*adebs-pa*, P. *btāb*, F. *gtāb*, Imp. *tob*. (Cf. WT. *aṭebs-pa*, P. *ṭebs* to be hit, to be struck.)*adebs-pa* (lit. to cast, to scatter, in : *sa-bon adebs-pa* to sow), P. *btāb*, F. *gtāb*, Imp. *tob* to cast, to scatter, to found, to establish, to "plant".

<sup>1</sup> *â-sem* to hold, to contain, may also belong here and be compared with T. *šon-ba*, etc., as above, in its sense of : to have room in, to hold.

<sup>2</sup> Or is *â-en* here really for *aen*, *uen*, *wen* ?

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps better *aei*, *uei*, *wei* (< \**bei* ?). Lh. has *n̄é* (*n̄éi*).

<sup>4</sup> A similar pair, one with explosive, the other with nasal final, persists also in Lh. *táp*, *tām* to beat, to hit, to strike.

## Âo

*â-ten* to assemble, to collect,  
to gather.

*â-ton(-ši)* to agree.

*â-zâr* to say.

*â-zân* to plant, to pierce, to  
thrust into.

*â-yu* <sup>2</sup> to put, to place.

*â-tsak* <sup>3</sup> to break.

*â-so* to cut, to split.

## T.

*aṭu-ba*, *aṭun-pa*, P. *aṭus*, *btus*,  
F. *btu*, Imp. *tus*, *btu* to  
gather, to collect.

*adu-ba*, P. *adus* to come  
together, to assemble. (Cf.  
next entry.)

*aṭun-pa* (also, however, *mṭun-*  
*pa*) id.

*adzer-ba*, *zer-ba*.

*adzugs-pa*, *zug-pa*,<sup>1</sup> P. *btsugs*,  
*zugs*, F. *gzugs*, Imp. *zug(s)*  
id.

*aʃug-pa*, P. *bčug*, F. *gžug*,  
Imp. *čug* to put into,  
to inject. (Cf. next entry.)

*adzud-pa*, P. *btsud*, Imp. *tsud*  
to put into, to lay in.

*aʃud-pa* id.

*atsud-pa*, P. *tsud* to be put  
into, to go to, to enter.

*aʃug-pa*, P. *bčug*, F. *gžug*, Imp.  
*čug* to put, to put into.

*aʃog-pa*, P. *bžag*, F. *gžag*,  
Imp. *žog* to put, to place.

*ačag-pa*, P. *čag(s)* to be  
broken (intr.).

*gčog-pa*, P. *bčag*, Imp. *čog(s)*  
to break, to smash (tr.).

(Cf. *aʃig-pa*, P. *bžig*, F.  
*gžig*, Imp. *(b)šig* to break,  
to violate (a duty, vow,  
etc.), to destroy, to abolish,  
to annul.) (Cf. next entry.)

*ačad-pa*, P. *čad* to be cut into  
pieces.

*gčod-pa*, P. *bčad*, F. *gčad*,  
Imp. *čod* to cut, to break,  
to sever.

<sup>1</sup> Also : to sting, Âo *me-ták*.

<sup>2</sup> Notice the uncertain Tibetan final dropping out in Âo, and see next  
two entries, from which it might seem that the Tibetan forms in final *-d*  
are here the nearest relatives of Âo.

<sup>3</sup> Probably the same root as *čák* in *čák(-má)*, *čák(-rep)* to break.

Âo	T.
<i>â-sa</i> to make, to build.	<i>ača-ba</i> , P. <i>bčas</i> (rarely <i>ačas</i> ), F. <i>bča</i> , Imp. <i>čos</i> id. <i>ačos-pa</i> , P. <i>bčos</i> , <i>ačos</i> , F. <i>bčo</i> , Imp. <i>čos</i> id. <i>bzo-ba</i> , P. <i>bzos</i> to make, to manufacture. <i>ačsod-pa</i> , <i>ačsed-pa</i> (Cs. also <i>ačso-ba</i> ?), P. <i>btsos</i> , F. <i>btso</i> , Imp. <i>čsos</i> , <i>čsod</i> . <i>ači-ba</i> , P. <i>ši</i> . <i>bžar-ba</i> to scrape, to shave, to shear. <i>za-ba</i> , <i>bza-ba</i> , P. <i>zos</i> , <i>bzas</i> , F. <i>bza</i> , Imp. <i>zo</i> , <i>zos</i> . <i>ača-ba</i> . <i>ačse-ba</i> , P. <i>btses</i> , F. <i>btse</i> , <i>gtse</i> to pain, to hurt, to damage, to injure. <i>ačeb-pa</i> , P. <i>kebs</i> to over- shadow. <i>agyag-pa</i> , to be sold, spent, or expended. (Cf. <i>skyag-pa</i> , P. <i>bskyags</i> , F. <i>bskyag</i> , Imp. <i>skyog</i> to spend, to expend). <i>skem-pa</i> , P. <i>bskams</i> , F. <i>bskam</i> , Imp. <i>skom(s)</i> . <i>rnañ-ba</i> , P. <i>brnañs</i> , to be checked, stopped, or shut off, whence; to be choked. <i>ačsañ-ba</i> , P. <i>sañs</i> to clean. <i>rdeg(s)-pa</i> , P. <i>(b)rdegs</i> , F. <i>brdeg</i> , Imp. <i>(b)rdeg(s)</i> to beat, to hit, to strike. (Cf. <i>čug-pa</i> to hit, to strike against.)
<i>â-so</i> to cook.	
<i>â-sa</i> to die.	
<i>â-sa</i> to shave.	
<i>â-či</i> to eat, to devour.	
<i>â-ši</i> to gnaw.	
<i>â-ši</i> to pain.	
<i>â-kam(-bân, -dâk)</i> <sup>1</sup> to over- shadow to shade.	
<i>â-yok</i> to sell.	
<i>â-koñ</i> to dry.	
<i>â-nân</i> to choke. (Cf. <i>â-nen</i> to stop.)	
<i>â-szoñ</i> to be pure, to purify (in <i>te-â-szoñ-tet</i> pure).	
<i>â-tsak, â-zak</i> to beat, to hit.	

<sup>1</sup> For the Âo final compare Abor-Miri *kom*, *i-kom* to cover up, to protect (as against sun, heat, etc.), Chinese 衾 \**kjəm* quilt, coverlet (cf. also ? T. *kyim* house (lit. covering, shelter ?); against this, however, see Laufer, *Si-Hia*, pp. 47-8). The direct relative of T. *ačeb-pa* is probably rather to be seen in Âo *te-kap*, *te-káp* skin (lit. covering).

Âo	T.
<i>â-tsañ</i> to beat, to hit.	<i>rduñ-ba</i> , <i>bduñ-ba</i> , P. <i>brduñs</i> , F. <i>brduñ</i> , Imp. (b) <i>rduñ(s)</i> to beat, to hit, to strike.
<i>â-yoñ</i> to drink, to suck.	<i>afuñ-ba</i> , P. <i>afuñs</i> (Cs. also <i>btuñs</i> , F. <i>btuñ</i> , Imp. <i>btuñ</i> ), Imp. <i>afuñ</i> .
<i>â-râk</i> to fasten, to bind.	<i>agros-pa</i> , <i>agrag-pa</i> , <i>grags-pa</i> .
<i>â-lem</i> <sup>1</sup> to spread.	<i>agrem(s)-pa</i> , P. <i>bkram</i> , F. <i>dgram</i> , Imp. <i>kroms</i> .
<i>â-o</i> <sup>2</sup> to go.	<i>agro-ba</i> , <i>agrod-pa</i> , <i>bgrod-pa</i> .

Cross correspondences to Tibetan *m-* occur in :—

Âo	T.
<i>â-nen</i> to press.	<i>non-pa</i> , also <i>gnon</i> , P. <i>gnan</i> , <i>mnan</i> .
<i>â-ši</i> to say.	<i>mči-ba</i> .

### 3. *te-* of Series I

§ 140. This prefix in the formation of verbal noun derivatives (substantival and adjectival) appears before the simple verb root, the root with *me-*, and the root with *â-*, in which last case it coalesces with *â-* and is usually written *tâ-*, though here *te-â-*<sup>3</sup> is given to show its composition.

The connection of this prefix with Tibetan *de* that, is made clearer by such intermediate forms as Sikkim Tibetan *te* the independent demonstrative “that”.

*te-* with the plain root occurs in :—

*te-lân-kâ* adj. high.

*te-čâk-mâ* subst. crack, fr. *čâk-mâ* to crack (intr.).

*te-sân-wâ* subst. light, fr. *sân-wâ* to light.

*te-nem-bân-tsa* subst. cover, fr. *nem-bân* to cover.

With the root in *me-* we have :—

*te-me-ten* adj. moist, fr. *me-ten* to moisten.

*te-me-či* subst. bud, fr. *me-či* to bud.

*te-me-nuñ-râ* subst. grief, fr. *me-nuñ-râ* to grieve.

<sup>1</sup> See, however, § 135 *sup*.

<sup>2</sup> For *â-ro*, *â-ro*? Cf. *Lhôtâ wô* (from *γuo*?), *Semâ gwo*, which clarify the connection.

<sup>3</sup> Kachin, where it uses the demonstrative pronoun *dai* that, before roots with adhering *a-*, gives a compound *dai a-* of a similar nature. The analogy even extends to the sense which is often reduced in Kachin to the same level as *Âo te-â-* in that the demonstrative force of *dai* is lost, as, for instance, in *ši dai a-mu ga-lâ-ai* He is doing the work (lit. that work).

With verb roots in *â* :—

*te-â-zuñ* adj. good, fr. *â-zuñ* to be good.

*te-â-koñ* adj. dry, fr. *â-koñ* to dry.

*te-â-zañ-lâ* adj. empty, fr. *â-zañ* to empty.

*te-â-mân* subst. faith, fr. *â-mân* to believe.

*te-â-lep* }  
*te-â-lân* } subst. cut, fr. { *â-lep* }  
*te-â-wâ* } { *â-lân* } to cut.  
               { *â-wâ* }

*te-â-lem-tsa* subst. division, fr. *â-lem* to divide.

To be sharply distinguished from this compound *tâ-(te-â-)* there occurs in certain other usages a form *tâ* which is almost certainly simple, temporal in meaning, and to be connected with Tipurâ *tâ*, Bârâ, Gârô, etc., *dâ* now, and also probably with the Tibetan temporal adverb *da* now, at the present time, which functions side by side with the demonstrative root *adi* this. *do* this (i.e. this time ?) found, as Jäschke notes (*Dic.*, 256–7) only in a few cases (cf. Laufer, T'P., xv, p. 57 n.) seems to be another form of this temporal adv. *da*.

The following table shows how this simple *Âo tâ-* corresponds to Tibetan temporal *da* on the one hand, and how, on the other, demonstratives frequently replace it in Tibetan and related languages.

	Âo Nâgâ.	Tibetan.	Kachin.	Mikir.
	Temporal.	Advbs. Prefixed.	Demonstr.	Pronouns Prefixed.
To-day	<i>tâ-na</i> <i>tâ-nap</i>	<i>da-re</i> ; <i>do-žag</i> <i>do-mod</i>	<i>di-rin</i> (WT.) <i>de-rin</i> (CT.)	<i>dai-ni</i>  <i>pî-nî</i> <i>mî-nî</i> (cf. <i>pe-năp</i> , <i>me-năp</i> to-morrow)
To-night	<i>tâ-o-nun</i>	<i>do-nub</i> <i>do-gdon</i>	<i>adi-nam</i>	<i>dai-na</i> <i>pâ-nin-vě</i> (= <i>pe-â-nin-vě</i> ?)
This year	<i>tâ-kam</i>	<i>da-lo</i>	<i>adi-lo</i>	<i>dai-nin</i>

A link between *Âo tâ* and Tibetan *da* is furnished by Sikkim Tibetan *tâ*<sup>1</sup> in *tâ-rin* to-day, *tâ-son* this morning (T. *da-nan*, *da-nans* = CT. *da-rans* this morning). Desgodins<sup>2</sup> gives *da-rin* and *'a-rin* as alternate forms of *de-rin* in the Tibetan spoken language. Is *de* the base here, and non-demonstrative ? Cf. the so-called "gerundial" particle *-de*, *-te* of present time. Have we here a root = "being" > present time, "now" ?

## (b) Elements Standing after the Root

### 1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 141. These are numerous. Among others are :—

*-rep-* with intensive force = "very, much, all", and similar ideas. It is probably the same root as Tibetan *rab*, also a root of intensity, generally meaning "superior, excellent", also "much, plentiful". In *rab-tu* Tibetan has an adverb "very".

<sup>1</sup> In *tâ-to* now, see Sandberg, *Manual of the Sikkim Bhutia Language*, p. 52 ; *lta-lto* acc. Desgodins, *Gram. Thibét. pour le Langage parlé*, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 59.



The actual meanings of such constructions as the following in *Âo* are then clear : *â-ku-rep* to pound very much (*i.e.* to pound to pieces), *lep-rep* to cut very much (*i.e.* to cut to pieces), *â-ŋet-rep* to squeeze very much (*i.e.* so as "to break by grasping", *v.* Clark, *Gr.* 29).

- ši-* with a general repetitive or continuative force = (a) "again, again and again", whence "repeatedly, continuously, always", (b) (most frequently with verbs of motion) "back and forth, to and fro", whence, when contact is involved, "together" (cf. Siyin -*čī*°, § 197).

A definite separation of these two usages is not always possible. It is probable that -*ši-* is in many instances the same element as -*rči-* (*r* euphonic) in Chutiya.<sup>1</sup> -*ši-* is frequently simply a general intensive particle. Its use is illustrated in the following :—

- (a) *li-ši* to stay, to remain (lit. to be continuously (at hand)), from *â-li* to be.  
*lem-ši* to divide, to distribute (to apportion successively), from *â-lem* to apportion.  
*â-nok-ši* to quake, to quiver (to shake continuously).  
 (b) *â-ei-ši* to rub (back and forth, or together), to mix (together).  
*â-ŋet-ši* to squeeze (together).  
*nuñ-ši* to push, to shove (together (or continuously ?)).  
*â-nāk-ši* (or *â-nāk*) to scratch (together).

This second usage properly belongs under the Directives below (§ 142).

- tep-* with reciprocal force = "one another". It corresponds to Lhôtâ -*tâ-* (§ 153).

<i>me-sem</i>	<i>me-sem-tep</i>
<i>me-sen</i>	<i>me-sen-tep</i>
<i>me-ten</i>	<i>me-ten-tep</i>
<i>me-ŋâ</i> to join.	<i>me-ŋâ-tep</i> <sup>2</sup> to join together.

<sup>1</sup> See Brown, *Outline Grammar of Deori Chutiya*, p. 31 (e.g. *la-re-rči* to keep giving, fr. *la-re* to give); LSI. iii, 2, p. 121. The simpler force of "again" in *Âo* -*ši*, in e.g. *len-ši* to rebind, to bind again, fr. *â-len* to bind, makes it probable that it is originally connected with *ši-â* again, used before the verb (cf. Clark, *Ao Naga Gr.*, pp. 29, 32).

<sup>2</sup> Clark (*Ao Naga Gr.*, p. 133) writes *matep*. The Lhôtâ root is *wó* (v. § 153). Bo'h are probably cognate to Tibetan *abyor-ba*, *abyar-ba* to stick, adhere, or be joined to. *Âo*, however, has allowed the root to coalesce with the simple prefix *me-* (v. § 138).

<i>me-za</i>	} to mix.	<i>me-za-tep</i>	} to mix together.
<i>me-yok</i>		<i>me-yok-tep</i>	
<i>â-jep</i>		<i>â-jep-tep</i>	
<i>myim</i> <sup>1</sup> to love.		<i>myim-tep</i> to love one another.	

*-lok-* with associative force = "together". Perhaps this is the same root as *lok* many (or, to be many) in *te-lok* subst. crowd,<sup>2</sup> and is probably cognate to Tibetan *agrogs-pa* to be associated, *grogs* > col. *rog* associate, companion, friend.

With this associative force it occurs, among others, in the following :—

*â-tâ-lok, tân-lok, en-lok, me-uâ-lok*,<sup>3</sup> *kân-lok, ku-lok* to atach.

*me-ĵâ-lok, me-ĵen-lok, â-tep-lok, nep-lok* to fasten.

*me-yi-lok* (?),<sup>4</sup> *zak-lok* to join.

This element is almost the same as *-tep-* in force, as such synonyms as *me-uâ-lok, me-uâ-tep* to attach or join together, *me-ĵâ-lok, me-ĵâ-tep* to fasten together, *zak-lok, zak-tep* to join together, clearly show.

## 2. Directive Infixes

§ 142. Infixes with directive value standing after the verb root are more commonly found in this language than usual, but as their appearance here is only the normal compensation for the disappearance of the directive prefix principle, it is only what we might expect. The principal are :

*-dân-*. Indicates the verbal action as directed "to, at, into", etc., the object, and is probably the same particle which is found with substantives as a dative suffix. Sometimes it directly repeats in the verb such a suffix attached to the object, as, for instance, in *pâ-dân â-soñ-dân-ân* "ask him" (lit. "to him put an inquiry to"). In this way it comes about that *-dân* is found frequently associated with verbs of speaking, seeing, thinking, etc., which have an inherent dative force, as, for instance :—

<sup>1</sup> For this writing, see § 138.

<sup>2</sup> "A group, a multitude" acc. Clark (*Gr.* 11), though *lok* perhaps carries rather the sense of "association: being associated". Cf. Lhôtâ *kô-lôk* pile, company, group, which virtually preserves the initial consonant group (*gr*) of Tibetan.

<sup>3</sup> See note 2, p. 135.

<sup>4</sup> Clark writes *meilok* (*Gr.* 133).

*â-son-dân* to ask, to inquire.

*â-tem-dân* to threaten.

*â-sep-dân* }  
*â-jam-dân* } to feel.

*â-ji-dân* to examine, to look into or after, to care for.

*lem-dân* to meditate upon, to think about.

Incidentally, it may be noted here, that this particle may be related to the dative directive infix *-dîn-* found in Hallâm and Kolhreng (Old Kuki group). There, *-dîn-* retains its normal position before the verb, and, like *Âo-dân-*, serves to repeat in the verb the dative relation which this has to the object (v. § 165). Compare also T. *mdun* “the fore-part, the front side of a thing”, used with the dative *-la*, loc. *-na*, term. *-du*, and abl. *-nas*, to indicate “before, at, to”, the object, as: *mdun-la* < *on-ba* “to come up to”, *mdun-du pyin-pa*, id.

*-dâk-*, *-tâk-*, is common with verbs of contact, conveying the sense of “against, on, upon, into”, as in:—

*â-en*, *â-on* to throw, *en-tâk*, *on-tâk* to throw at (and hit), lit. to throw against.<sup>1</sup>

*â-sa* to pour, *sa-dâk* to pour into.

Compare T. *fog* “that which is uppermost” used with the term. *-tu* with the sense of “on, upon, to, towards”, as *fog-tu kel-ba* “to grieve, to hurt a person’s feelings” (lit. to load or put (trouble) onto (another)) (v. Jk. D. 237, s.v. *fog*).

*-dok-*, *-tok-*, has an ablative force, “away, off, out from,” and is very common with verbs of separation.

*â-lep* }  
*â-len* } to cut

*lep-tok* }  
*len-tok* } to cut off.

*â-en* to throw.

*en-tok* to throw or drive away, to pour out.

*me-ši* to be clean.

*me-ši-dok* to clean away, to remove by cleaning.

*-tsa-*, seems to indicate that the action of the verb is accomplished for the benefit of, or falls upon some person other than, the speaker. It consequently points to the object and is equivalent to a dative directive infix. *â-ga* to give, is, for instance, the form used when the giving is to the subject (as in “he gave it to me”), but *â-ga-tsa*

<sup>1</sup> Also *en-tâk-â*, *on-tâk-â* to prostrate oneself (lit. throwing (oneself) to (the ground)), T. *sa-la abebs-pa*.

is employed when it is to someone else (as in "he gave it to him").

This usage seems to be comparable to that of suffixed -s in Tibetan for the formation of transitive verbs. See again below, § 143.

*-ket-*, indicates motion upwards, "up, upon, on, onto", etc.

*â-zoñ* to lift.                      *â-zoñ-ket* to lift up onto.

*me-sep* to absorb                  *me-sep-ket* to suck up.

*-zak-*, indicates motion downwards, "down onto, into", etc.

*â-zoñ* to lift.                      *â-zoñ-zak* to lift down.

*â-en* to throw, to cast.          *en-zak* to pour (down) into.

This particle is probably related to Lushei *-zuk-* the directive infix *before* verbs, there indicating motion downwards, and may, like *-zuk-*, have originated from a verb root (Lushei *zuk* vb. intr. = to go down, to descend, Burmese *sak*), and thus strictly not belong here. Perhaps this is evidence that such particles in *Âo* have actually been moved from the front to the back of the verb (cf. *-dân*, sup.).

*-ok-*, appears to carry a general sense of movement "away from, into, forth, or down", in consonance with which it occurs in *kab-ok*, *te-kab-ok*<sup>1</sup> "under, below", and is to be equated with T. *og*, a root signifying "below" (v. Jk. D. 501), B. *᥄᥇᥇ ᥄k* "the space under or below anything, below," Old B. *᥄᥇᥇* (v. Duroiselle, JBRs., vi (1916), p. 97).

As a verbal infix, it occurs in :—

*pu-ok* to seize (= to remove or carry away ?)

*in-ok*, *â-sen-ok*, *sa-ok*, *ši-ok* to put (away or down) into.

*ši-ok* to send forth word (to).

*â-ni-ok* to lead away (as a woman in marriage).

*zen-ok* to drop,<sup>2</sup> to drip down (as water) (*â-zen* = to escape).

The idea of "force"<sup>3</sup> does not seem to be inherent in this element, *ko-rân sem-ok* standing in contradistinction to *ko-rân â-sem* rather in that the first means "to pull

<sup>1</sup> These writings—(Clark, *Ao Naga Gr.*, pp. 42, 96, 173, writes *kabok*, *tekabok*)—are indicated by Lh. *ô-kap-we*, *ô-kap-i*, *ô-kap-i* below, under, where *-we* and *-i* are locative suffixes.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lh. *zân-ôô* id. (§ 154).

<sup>3</sup> Clark, *Ao Naga Grammar*, p. 28.

down a hat (well onto one's head) " while the second means simply " to put on a hat (lightly) ".

-*ši*- appears sometimes to carry the force of "away, out, forth, after", though it may be the same particle as -*ši*- (b) above (§ 141).

*rā-ši* to separate.

*sen-ši* to leave, to abandon, to go away from.

*ā-ri-ši* to pursue, to run after.

*ā-ni-ši* to follow (after).

*sen-ši*, *tsa-ši* to scatter.

If this is an independent particle it is probable that it is the same element as Lh. -*či*- (§ 154).

### 3. The Causative Infix -*dāk-tsa*-

§ 143. The first element in the causative infix -*dāk-tsa*- (= Lh. -*tók*-, § 155) is probably the same root as T. *aʃug-pa* (P. *bčug*, F. *gžug*, Imp. *čug*) "to cause, to compel", used in exactly the same way. Thus *Âo ā-či-dāk-tsa* = T. *za-r aʃug-pa* "to cause (or prevail upon a person) to eat". The second element -*tsa*- which is also used alone as a causative infix, is perhaps comparable to the B. causative suffix -*čē*, though, on the other hand, it may be nothing but the *Âo* directive element -*tsa* (as above) indicating that the (causative) verbal action falls upon an external object and not on the speaker.<sup>1</sup>

## THE SUBSTANTIVE

### *Elements Standing before the Root*

#### 1. *me*-, *mo*-, *mu*-

§ 144. *me*-, *mo*-, *mu*- with the substantive is a different prefix from *me*- with verbs, just as Tibetan *m*- is different in the two cases. The fact of its showing vowel harmony with substantives (*me*- preceding radical *e*, *i*, *a*, *mo*- preceding *o*, and *mu*- preceding *u*) sets it apart from the verbal prefix which has only one form *me*-.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> If -*tsa* is this directive element, it is not a little interesting that here in *Âo* association with roots carrying a causative sense has elevated it from its originally purely directive function to an apparently "causative" one, just as it did Tibetan -*s*-. See §§ 42-4, 47.

<sup>2</sup> Very rarely the vowel harmony forms characteristic of the prefix with the substantive appear in the domain of the verb, as in *mo-kon* to be or become cold, whence *te-mo-kon* adj. cold. Or is *mo-kon* here basically a substantive? Cf. T. *gran-ba* vb. to be or become cold, adj. cold, subst. coldness. The Lhôtâ cognate *n-kôn* cold is probably a direct application of a verb to an adjectival sense.

In most cases *me-*, *mo-*, *mu-* is preceded by *te-* (§ 145), but sometimes occurs alone. In either case it corresponds directly to *m-* in Tibetan, cognates from which are added below, where they exist. For correspondence with Lhôtâ Nâgâ *m-*, *n-*, see § 156.

In the following parts of the human body this prefix occurs :

Âo	T.
<i>me-či</i> <sup>1</sup> lip.	<i>mčū</i> .
<i>me-tsa</i> <sup>1</sup> spittle.	<i>mčil-ma</i> .
<i>te-me-li</i> <sup>1</sup> tongue.	
<i>te-me-sen</i> liver	<i>mčin-pa</i> .
<i>te-me-yoñ</i> finger.	<i>mdzug(-gu)</i> <sup>2</sup>
<i>te-me-zañ</i> finger-nail.	
<i>te-mo-po</i> foot.	
<i>te-mo-kok</i> knee.	
<i>te-mu-luñ</i> mind.	
<i>te-mu-luñ-zañ</i> heart.	

## 2. *te-* of Series I

§ 145. *te-* of Series I is more widely spread than the older element *me-*, *mo-*, *mu-*, and occurs alone in, for instance, the following parts of the body :—

<i>te-ni</i> nose.	<i>te-nuk</i> , <i>te-rak</i> eye.
<i>te-nâ-roñ</i> ear.	<i>te-bân</i> mouth.
<i>te-zák</i> face.	<i>te-kâ</i> hand.
<i>te-tsuñ</i> foot, leg.	<i>te-ben</i> arm.
<i>te-po</i> tooth.	<i>te-rok</i> throat.
<i>te-pok-pok</i> lungs.	<i>te-pok</i> belly.
<i>te-roñ-toñ</i> , <i>te-pe-rem</i> back.	<i>te-mân</i> body.
<i>te-kap</i> , <i>te-kâp</i> skin.	<i>te-ret</i> , bone.

Rarely a form *to-* (apparently by vowel harmony) occurs, as in :—

<i>to-ko-lák</i> head.	<i>to-ko</i> chest.
------------------------	---------------------

With family relationships it is not so regular, though it occurs in :—

<i>te-bu</i> father.	<i>te-tsa</i> mother.
<i>te-nu</i> younger brother	<i>te-yi</i> elder sister.
<i>te-na</i> , <i>te-na-lá</i> sister.	<i>te-nu</i> , <i>te-nu-tsa</i> younger sister.

<sup>1</sup> v. § 149 n. The *i* <> *u* equation (v. § 117) is in evidence again here in *me-či* T. *mčū*.

<sup>2</sup> Whence the Âo form through *m-juñ(-gu)*? See § 26, s.v. *mdzug-gu*. In this event the prefix would be a verbal element and the form would not belong here. See also, Journ. Ling. Soc. Am., Vol. IV (1928), pp. 278, 279, 280.

§ 146. Here, parenthetically, may be conveniently introduced a note concerning the Jyarung dialect of Eastern Tibet.

Conrady, in a note appended to A. von Rosthorn's *Vokabularfragmente* in the ZDMG., Bd. 51 (1897), though calling attention to the use there of the same prefix *te-* as in some of the Nâgâ dialects, yet does not suggest a possible origin in either case.

It appears almost certain to the writer that the Jyarung prefix goes back, just as does that of Âo, to Tibetan *de* "that", in view of which Laufer's<sup>1</sup> orthography *de-* in Jyarung is probably more correct.

To regard this Tibetan dialect on the strength of its word forms as "one of the most archaic",<sup>2</sup> needs, then, qualification, as *de-* (*te-*) is not a survival from ancient times, but a later addition of an early post-classical date, before the words affected had lost the prefixes still written in standard Tibetan.<sup>3</sup>

The following compares some of the principal forms.<sup>4</sup>

	Tibetan.	Jyarung.	Âo Nâgâ.	Other
	acc. Laufer.	acc. v. Rosthorn.		Forms.
Hand	<i>lag</i> ; <i>pyag</i>	<i>ta-yak</i> <sup>5</sup>	<i>te-yŏ</i> (W.P.)	<i>te-kâ</i>
Foot	<i>rkañ</i>		<i>ta-mi</i> (W.P.)	<i>te-mo-po</i> <i>te-tsuñ</i>
Nose	<i>sna</i>	<i>de-š-nä</i>	<i>te-š-nŏ</i> (W.) <i>te-š-ni</i> (P.)	<i>te-ni</i>
Ear	<i>rna</i>	<i>d-r-nä</i>	<i>t-r-nŏ</i> (W.) <i>t-r-ni</i> (P.)	Tengsa Nâgâ <i>te-lâ(n)-nu</i>
Eye	<i>mig</i>	<i>d-mye</i>	<i>te-mniñk</i> (W.) <i>te-mniok</i> <sup>7</sup> (P.)	<i>te-nak</i> <i>te-nuk</i>
Neck	<i>ske</i> <i>mgur</i> , <i>mgul</i> <i>mgrin</i>	<i>de-m-ki</i>		<i>te-rok</i>
Mouth	<i>kä</i>		<i>te-kŭ</i> (W.) <i>te-š-nes</i> (P.)	<i>te-bân</i>
Tooth	<i>so</i>	<i>de-süe</i>		<i>te-po</i>
Tongue	<i>lŕe</i> ; <i>ljags</i>	<i>de-š-mi</i>		<i>te-me-li</i>

<sup>1</sup> See *Bird Divination among the Tibetans*, T'oung Pao, vol. xv (1914), p. 107, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Laufer, *loc. cit.*, but see *Si-Hia*, p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> This prefix *te-*, *de-*, and that which follows (Jyarung *ka-*, *kä-*) are not to be connected with *d-* and *g-* of Tibetan when appearing with substantives. These latter are of entirely different origin as shown in § 36.

<sup>4</sup> The following abbreviations are here used: W. Wassü; P. Pati (v. von Rosthorn, *loc. cit.*); L. Lepcha; Dim. Dimâ-sâ; AM. Abor-Miri; M. Mikir.

<sup>5</sup> It is possible that rather than a different categorical prefix *ta-* in place of *p* in T. *pyag* (see Laufer, *loc. cit.*), we have here the midway point of the purely phonetic change that transforms *pyag* into *ŕag* in Central Tibet and Khams. The stoppage at the midway point would result from analogy with other words in *te-*, *ta-*, *de-*, as given here.

<sup>6</sup> Perhaps a synonym compound (*\*nä + roñ*). Cf. T. *\*re-na* (v. Laufer, *Si-Hia*, p. 28, no. 10). With the Tibetan and Jyarung forms we may compare Digâru Mishmi *k-râ-nâ*, Thâmi (Darjeeling) *ku-l-nâ*. The element in *k*, however, is not pronominal. Elsewhere, as in Âo, the element in *r* falls out: Chulikâtâ Mishmi *a-ku-nâ*, Tângkhul Nâgâ *kä-nâ*, etc.

<sup>7</sup> Evidently from (*te-*)*mok* through (*te-*)*myok* (or (*te-*)*myuk*), and (*te-*)*m"yok*. The vowel agrees with Chinese *muk* as against Tibetan. (Cf. Laufer, *loc. cit.*)

	Tibetan.	Jyarung. acc. Laufer.	acc. v. Rosthorn.	Âo Nâgâ.	Other- Forms
Belly	. <i>lto</i> ; <i>pó</i>		<i>ta-k-tu</i> <sup>1</sup> (W.)	<i>te-pok</i>	L. <i>tă-fuk</i> , or (acc. LSI. iii, 1, 257) <i>ta- bák</i> .
Heart	. <i>shin</i>		<i>te-š-ni</i> (W.)	<i>te-mu-lun- zân</i>	
Lungs	. <i>glo</i>		<i>ta-š-lu</i> (W.)		Dim. <i>bô-s-ro</i> AM. <i>â-ro(p)</i>
Liver	. <i>mč'in</i>		<i>te-šie</i> (W.)	<i>te-me-sen</i>	
Man	. <i>mi</i>		<i>t-r-mi</i> (W.)		
Woman	. <i>mo</i>		<i>te-mi</i> (W.) <i>te-me</i> (P.)		

This dialect, in fact, stands in important particulars, just about where many of the Nâgâ and Bodo languages do.

Thus, in the matter of numerals, the prefix in *k-* (acc. Laufer), or *kô-* (acc. v. Rosthorn), is probably a class prefix like Tipurâ *kai-*, Gârô (Rugâ) *gai-*, etc., used in counting. The expanded forms in fact, are almost identical. Thus "four" is Wassû *kô-p-lî*, Pati *kô-p-lî*, Jyarung (Laufer) *k-b-lî* = Tipurâ *kai-b-rui*, Gârô (Rugâ) *gai-b-rî*. "Seven" is Wassû *kô-š-nês*,<sup>2</sup> Pati *kô-š-ne*, Jyarung (Laufer) *k-š-nis* = Tipurâ *kai-š-ni*, Gârô (Rugâ) *gai-s-nî*, with equally close correspondence in the remaining members.<sup>3</sup>

A fact which heightens the interest of this dialect is that it shows the same difference of prefix between de-verbal derivatives (adjectives), and pure substantives, which is almost everywhere observed in the Assam area, and in them possesses the two prefixes which originate in Tibetan *ko* and *de*.

Placed in the Table of § 104 the prefixes of Jyarung would appear as follows :—

	Series I					
	Substantive			Verb		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Jyarung			<i>de-, te-</i>			<i>ka-, kâ-, etc.</i>
Tibetan (independent pronoun equivalents)			<i>de</i>			<i>ko</i>

This leaves it still in best agreement with Âo in the matter of morphological age, since the latter language also is best represented in Series I.

Depending upon Hodgson's forms <sup>4</sup>, these as quoted by Hunter,<sup>5</sup> and the few given by von Rosthorn,<sup>6</sup> the following equivalences are interesting. The prefix in Jyarung is already showing some vowel harmony with the following root.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps really *te-âk-tu*, in which *âk* = *ok*, as in Gârô and Kôch, from original *pok* "belly".

<sup>2</sup> Burmese *ku-nač* probably goes back to some such form through *ku-h-nās* (for *ku-s-nās*).

<sup>3</sup> v. Laufer and v. Rosthorn as already cited, and (for the Bodo forms) LSI., iii, 2, pp. 132-7.

<sup>4</sup> *The Languages, Literature, and Religion of Nepâl and Tibet*, pt. ii, table following p. 82.

<sup>5</sup> *A Comparative Dictionary of the Non-Aryan Languages of India and High Asia*, pp. 167-94.

<sup>6</sup> *Vokabularfragmente ost-tibetischer Dialekte*, ZDMG. 51 (1897), p. 528.



	Tibetan.	Jyarung acc. Hodgson.	acc. v. Rosthorn	Âo Nâgâ	Other Forms.
Black	. <i>nag</i>	<i>ka-nak</i>	<i>kô-nŭ(k)</i> ( <i>kô-nŭ</i> <sup>o</sup> ) (W.)	<i>te-â-nâk</i>	Râ. <i>ga-sam</i>
Cold	. <i>grañ</i>	<i>ka-van-dro</i> <i>ka-mi-š-ta</i> (not hot ?)	<i>te-van-ió</i> (= ? : <i>te-van-yo</i> ) (W.)	<i>te-in-râ</i> ( <i>â-či-r</i> )	M. <i>ke-čun</i> Dîm. <i>ga-sain</i>
Good	. <i>bzañ</i> <i>legs</i>	<i>ka-s-ne</i>		<i>te-â-zuñ</i>	M. <i>ke-me</i>
Great	. <i>če, čen</i>	<i>ka-ŭi</i>	<i>kok-tie</i> ( <i>kô</i> <sup>o</sup> - <i>tie</i> ?) (W.)		M. <i>ke-ŭe</i> Bâ. <i>ga-det</i> Dîm. <i>ge-dê-bâ</i>
Green	.	<i>ka-r-myâk</i>		<i>â-mâk</i> <i>â-mâk-er</i>	M. <i>â-ke-ve</i>
Handsome	<i>mčor</i>	<i>kû-m-čûr</i>			
Hot		<i>ka(s)-sî</i> <i>ka-va(s)-si</i>	<i>te-sâ-lo</i> (= ? : <i>te-sâl-o</i> ) (W.)	<i>te-â-tsak</i>	M. <i>kâ-rom</i>
Long	. <i>riñ(-ba)</i> <i>sriñ-ba</i> , P. <i>bsriñs</i> , F. <i>bsriñ</i> to lengthen.	<i>ka-sri</i>		<i>te-â-lân(-ká)</i>	M. <i>ki-diñ</i> Dîm. <i>ga-lao</i>
Ripe	. <i>smiñ</i>	<i>ka-smân</i>		<i>te-â-men</i>	M. <i>ke-men</i>
Red	. <i>dmar</i>	<i>ka-ver-ni</i>	<i>or-ni</i> (W.)	<i>te-mer-em</i>	M. <i>â-ke-er</i>
Round	.	<i>kâ-lâr-lar</i>		<i>te-nâr-i</i> (?)	Lh. <i>e-kâ-lâ-lâ(-ká)</i> .
Short (man)		<i>ka-čin</i>		} <i>te-â-tsa</i>	Dîm.
Short (thing)		<i>ka-čan</i>			<i>gû-suñ</i>
Small	. <i>čuñ</i>	<i>ka-če</i>	<i>kok-čie</i> ( <i>kô</i> <sup>o</sup> - <i>čie</i> ?) (W.)		
Sour	. <i>skyur(-ba)</i>	<i>kû(č)-čûr</i> (or <i>kû-čur</i> ?)			
Straight	.	<i>ka-kas-to</i>			M. <i>ke-keñ</i>
Sweet	. <i>mñar</i>	<i>ka-m-ñar</i>			M. <i>ke-dok</i>
White	.	<i>ka-prom</i>	<i>kô-prom</i> (W.)		Dîm. <i>gû-pû</i>

## LHÔTÁ NĀGĀ

## PERSONAL PRONOUNS

§ 147. The Lhôtá pronouns fall into the following series :—

	Series A. (Plur. in <i>-tē<sup>n</sup></i> )	Series B. (Plur. in <i>-nô</i> ?) <sup>1</sup>	Series C. (Plur. (or dual ?) in <i>-ān</i> )	Possessive Forms
	Singular.	Singular.	Singular.	Singular.
1st p. .	<i>á, ai, á-ká</i>			<i>á</i>
2nd p. .	<i>nî-ná (-ná = instr.)</i>	<i>nî-ná, n-ná, ná (&lt; nî-(n)á), n-nô, nô</i> (Both really Plur.). ( <i>nô &lt; nî- (n)nô</i> ?) <sup>1</sup>		<i>nî</i>
3rd p. .	<i>ô-mô</i>	<i>šî, čî</i>	<i>hî, šî, čî, čô</i>	<i>ô-, ô-mô, šî</i>
	Plural.	Plural.	Plural.	Plural.
1st p. .	<i>e, e-ná (ná = instr.)</i>			<i>e, en</i> (dual ?)
2nd p. .	<i>e-te n-tē<sup>n</sup> (= nî- tē<sup>n</sup>)</i>	<i>nî</i> (Really sing.), <i>nî-nô</i>		<i>e-ten n-tē<sup>n</sup>, nîn</i> (dual ?)
3rd p. .	<i>ô-tē<sup>n</sup>, ô-n-te</i>	<i>šî-á-nô, čî-á- nô</i>	<i>hî-án, šî-án, čî-án, čô-án</i>	<i>ô-tē<sup>n</sup>, ô-n-te, šî-án, čô-án</i>

Among the singular forms, *hî, šî* of the 3rd person are really demonstratives, “this,” while *čî, čô* are “that”.

In the plural *hî-án, šî-án, šî-á-nô* are “these”, and *čî-án, čî-á-nô, čô-án, ô-tē<sup>n</sup> (?)*, *ô-n-te (?)* are “those”.

The plural form *ô-n-te* seems to be built upon a dual in *-n* (= *nî* “two”), also found in Kachin (v. § 148), which perhaps the possessive forms *en* and *nîn* represent. The Kachin dual is probably derived from *yan* (K’auri *yen*) “both”, which in its full form is used to form the dual of substantives.

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Āo suffix *-nok*, §§ 136-7.

## DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

§ 148. The demonstrative pronouns are thus the following :

Series A. (Plur. in -tê <sup>n</sup> )	Series B (Plur. in -nô ?)	Series C. (Plur. (or dual ?) in -ân)
Singular.	Singular.	Singular.
ô in { ô-êi "that" ô-mô	ši "this", êi "that"	hi "this", ši "this". êi "that", êô "that".
Plural.	Plural.	Plural.
ô-tê <sup>n</sup> , ô-n-te	ši-â-nô, êi-â-nô	hi-ân, ši-ân, ši-â <sup>n</sup> êi-ân, êô-ân

The root ô is possibly to be compared with o that (that one, he) in the Himalayan languages Newâri, Pahrî, Lepcha, etc., but the better equation is probably with Dîmâ-sâ bô (§ 118). If the latter is correct we may hazard \*bô and \*bê as the original forms of Lhôtâ ô- and e-, a conjecture to which some probability is lent by the frequent loss in Lhôtâ, as in Âo, of initial labials (v. § 135).

ô-mô, it may be observed, closely resembles the usual Kuki-Chin form of the 3rd personal pronoun a-ma (cf. § 136 sup.).

In the plurals the suffix -tê<sup>n</sup>, -te is probably the same as that found with Kachin pronouns as -tê. The form ô-n-te is probably a plural formed from the dual in -n (= ni two), similar to that found in Kachin where the form corresponding to ô-n-te of Lhôtâ is ša-n-tê (= ši-a-n-tê) they, from ši (sing.) he, she, it.

## THE VERB

(a) *Elements Standing before the Root*

1. m-, n- of Series 0.

§ 149. In unvocalized m-, n-<sup>1</sup> Lhôtâ possesses before verb roots the same ancient prefix which in Âo occurs as me- (§ 138), to which it frequently directly corresponds, as in :—

<sup>1</sup> n- is a phonetic variant called forth by consonantal harmony, and replacing m- before dental, guttural, and palatal initials. The negative prefix of this language is also affected in the same way, an adjustment evidently due to loss of a vowel from the prefix.

Lh.	Âo
<i>m-yáp.</i>	<i>me-jep</i> to pinch.
<i>m-yák.</i>	<i>me-zak</i> to lick.
<i>n-nôk</i> to rub between the hands.	<i>me-nok(-ši)</i> to rub.
<i>n-tszü, n-tsi.</i>	<i>ma-sa</i> to knot, to tie.
<i>n-šá(k ?)</i>	<i>me-sa</i> to comb.
<i>n-zá.</i>	<i>me-za</i> to anoint.
<i>n-zü(-tá).</i>	<i>ma-za(-tep)</i> to mix, to mingle.
<i>n-zá.</i>	<i>me-yok</i> to swallow.
<i>n-tsi.</i>	<i>me-tet</i> to know.
<i>n-te-či.</i>	<i>me-so</i> to awaken, to arouse.
<i>n-tsak.</i>	<i>me-tsak</i> to nip.
<i>n-tsap</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>me-sep</i> to suck.
<i>e-n-či</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>me-či</i> to peck.
<i>e-n-fák.</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>me-sák</i> to itch.

Directly equivalent to Tibetan *m-* it occurs in :—

Lh.	T.
<i>n-tsôn</i> to be high (in <i>n-tsôn-á</i> adj. high.).	<i>mfo-ba</i> to be high, <i>mfon-po</i> adj. high (v. § 55).
<i>m-yân</i> to be even, to be level (in <i>m-yân-á</i> adj. even, level).	<i>mñam-pa</i> to be even or level ; adj. even, level.

Cross correspondences to Âo *á-* are moderately frequent and occur in the following :—

Lh.	Âo
<i>m-pen</i> to throw over the shoulder.	<i>á-en</i> to throw, to fling.
<i>m-hôn, m-hôm.</i>	<i>á-zuñ</i> to be good.
<i>n-šák.</i>	<i>á-sak</i> to scratch.
<i>n-či</i> (in <i>n-či-á</i> adj. wet).	<i>á-já</i> to wet.
<i>n-tôn, ten.</i>	<i>á-ten</i> to pick or gather (as leaves).
<i>n-tsañ</i> to be pure (in <i>n-tsañ-á</i> adj. pure).	<i>á-szoñ</i> to be pure, to purify (in <i>te-á-szoñ-tel</i> adj. pure).

<sup>1</sup> Possibly here Lhôtâ *n-* and Âo *me-* represent an old root for "mouth" (cf. Lh. *n-li*, Âo *te-me-li* tongue, etc.), in which event *n-tsap* and *me-sep* are really "with the mouth (*n-*, *me-*) to touch or feel" (Âo *á-sep(-dân)* to feel). In this connection Lh. *n-čá*, Âo *me-tsa*, T. *mčil* spittle, Âo *me-či*, T. *mčü* lip, are involved. *me-(m-, n-)*, however, cannot yet be definitely accepted as such a root, notwithstanding such independent forms as Angâmi (Tengima) *mê*, Êmpêo (*mi-*)*mui*, Sopvomâ (*u(m)-*)*mê*, Mozome-Angâmi (Brown) *a-mû*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> In these forms the *e-* is probably prosthetic and without meaning.

Similarly, cross correspondences occur also to Tibetan *b-*, *a-*,<sup>1</sup> as in the following :—

Lh.	T.
<i>m-pen</i> to put on (as clothes), to throw over the shoulder.	<i>apen-pa</i> , P. <i>apāns</i> , F. <i>apān</i> , Imp. <i>pon</i> , <i>pāns</i> to throw, cast, or fling.
<i>m-hôn</i> , <i>m-hôm</i> .	<i>bzan-ba</i> to be good; good.
<i>m-yāk</i> .	<i>ldag-pa</i> , P. <i>bldags</i> , F. <i>bldag</i> , Imp. <i>ldog</i> to lick.
<i>n-tôn</i> to pick, to gather (as leaves).	<i>atu-ba</i> , <i>atun-pa</i> , P. <i>atus</i> , <i>btus</i> , F. <i>btu</i> , Imp. <i>tus</i> , <i>btu</i> to gather, to collect.
<i>n-tsi</i> .	<i>bšes-pa</i> , <i>šes-pa</i> to know.
<i>n-tsap</i> .	<i>añib(s)-pa</i> , P. <i>bžibs</i> ( <i>gžibs</i> ), F. <i>bžib</i> ( <i>gžib</i> ) to suck.
<i>n-čak</i> to put or place (wood on the fire).	<i>añug-pa</i> , P. <i>bčug(s)</i> , <i>añugs</i> , F. <i>gžug</i> , Imp. <i>čug</i> to put into, to infuse, to inject.
<i>n-kam-tet</i> <sup>2</sup> to stoop.	<i>agum-pa</i> , P. <i>bkum</i> , F. <i>dgum</i> , Imp. <i>kum(s)</i> to bend, to make crooked.

## 2. *e*-<sup>3</sup> of Series 0

§ 150. This prefix corresponds regularly with verbs to its relatives in the same series.

With *Âo a-* we have the following :—

Lh.	Âo
<i>e-tsak</i> to be cold.	<i>â-sak</i> .
<i>e-tsi</i> to measure.	<i>â-sâ(-zak)</i> .
<i>e-szân</i> to run.	<i>â-sam</i> .
<i>e-šô</i> to put in or into.	<i>â-sâ</i> .
<i>e-čam(-tâ)</i> to swear.	<i>â-zañ</i> .

<sup>1</sup> The original distinction between the force of *n-* (Lh.), *m-* (T.) and *a-*, *b-* (T.), i.e. inactive intransitive as against an active meaning (v. §§ 26, 27, 30) still persists in some cases, as in Lh. *n-tsañ* to be pure (in *n-tsañ-â* adj. pure), T. *atsan-ba*, P. *sañs* to clean.

<sup>2</sup> Apparently the same element as Tibetan *adud-pa*, P. *btud*, F. *gdud* (Cs.), Imp. *dud*, *tud* (Cs.) to bend or bow down, to bow, to make a bow, the whole evidently being a synonym compound.

A second Lhôtâ form *n-ku-tet* to stoop, to bend, is probably related in its first element to Tibetan *dgu-ba* to bend, to make crooked, which has apparently allowed its *m-* form to lapse into *mgu-r* neck, i.e. that which bends, inclines or is flexible (v. § 26). There is, at least, no other *m-* form to place beside it.

<sup>3</sup> In view of its relationship to *Âo a-* and T. *a-* (<\**ha-*), a more correct writing would be *â-*. I have, however, retained the usual form *e-* here.

Lh.	Âo
<i>e-čam</i> to lift.	<i>â-zoñ.</i>
<i>e-čô</i> to polish.	<i>â-ši.</i>
<i>e-čûñ</i> to pierce.	<i>â-tsañ.</i>
<i>e-kû</i> to ring (as a bell).	<i>â-ku.</i>
<i>e-ñâ</i> to hear, to observe, to obey.	<i>â-ñâ.</i>
<i>e-nak</i> to scratch.	<i>â-nâk.</i>
<i>e-nô</i> to ache.	<i>â-nu.</i>
<i>e(n)-nô</i> to wear earrings.	<i>â-nu</i> to wear jewellery.
<i>e-yik</i> to wear a necklace.	<i>â-yok</i> to wear jewellery.
<i>e-kû</i> to cough.	<i>â-ket.</i>
<i>e-nyok</i> to shake.	<i>â-nok.</i>
<i>e-zô</i> to say.	<i>â-ši.</i>

Like Âo *â-*, Lhôtâ *e-* corresponds to Tibetan *b-*, *a-*, in some few instances, as in :—

Lh.	T.
<i>e-čam</i> to lift.	<i>señ-ba</i> , P. <i>bsaṅs</i> , F. <i>bsaṅ</i> , <i>bsen</i> .
<i>e-čûñ</i> to pierce.	<i>aḍzugs-pa</i> , <i>zug-pa</i> , P. <i>btsugs</i> , <i>zugs</i> , F. <i>gzugs</i> , Imp. <i>zug(s)</i> , id.
	<i>aḷjug-pa</i> . P. <i>bčug</i> , F. <i>gžug</i> , Imp. <i>čug</i> to put into, to infuse, to inject (v. § 139 <i>sup.</i> ).
<i>e-drâ</i> to lead, to guide.	<i>aḍren-pa</i> , P. <i>draṅ(s)</i> , F. <i>draṅ</i> , Imp. <i>dron(s)</i> .
<i>e-tsak</i> to be cold.	<i>aḳyags-pa</i> to feel cold, to be chilly.
<i>e-kû</i> to ring (a bell).	<i>aḳrol-ba</i> , P. and F. <i>dkrol</i> , Imp. <i>ḳrol</i> .

Cross correspondences to Âo *me-* occur in :—

Lh.	Âo
<i>e-čûñ(-tâ)</i> to join.	<i>me-sem(-tep)</i> , <i>me-sen(-tep)</i> , <i>me-ten(-tep)</i> .
<i>e-ñû</i> to smell (intr.).	<i>me-nem</i> .

§ 151. Roots with this prefix show a decided tendency to pass into substantival and adjectival meanings,<sup>1</sup> and in these cases the root without prefix is generally retained in a verbal sense.

Much less frequently this happens in Âo, as in *â-ro* hot, *â-so* narrow. The possession of the prefix *te-*, which performs this office, however, allows the great majority of *â-* verbs to remain as verbs (§ 139).

This is exactly what so often happens in Kachin <sup>1</sup> (§§ 80, 69), and is doubtless traceable in Lhôtâ, as in Kachin, to a basically genitive force inherent in the prefix which comes, in consequence, to function simply as a link element. In Lhôtâ, however, there is a second incentive for these lapses in the lack of a pronominal element in Series I to carry out the functions assumed by *te-* in Âo.

The resulting lapses correspond in sense to Âo equivalents with this prefix, as may be seen in the following :—

Lhôtâ verb without

prefix	Lhôtâ lapsed form	Âo form in <i>te-</i>
<i>mien</i> to ripen	<i>e-mê</i> ripe	<i>te-â-men</i> ripe.
<i>kâm</i> to live	<i>e-kâm</i> alive, living	<i>te-â-kam</i> alive,
<i>šü</i> to be raw	<i>e-šü</i> raw	<i>te-â-za</i> raw. [living.
<i>kyañ</i> to become dry	<i>e-kyañ</i> dry	<i>te-â-koñ</i> dry.
<i>čan</i> to be empty	<i>e-čan</i> empty	<i>te-â-zân-lâ</i> empty.
<i>fû</i> to weigh	<i>e-fû</i> weight	( <i>te-â-o</i> weight ?). <sup>2</sup>
<i>van</i> to capture	<i>e-van</i> captive	
<i>čü</i> to divide, to share	<i>e-čü</i> part, share	

Through the circumstances of their lapse, such *e-* forms of Lhôtâ have come to coincide in sense with Lepcha derivatives in *a-*, where the prefix, however, is of totally different origin, being, in fact, the mechanical non-pronominal prefix 'a- (ཨ) of Tibetan, which began its career before family relationship terms.

Such apparent correspondences of quite unrelated prefixes may be illustrated by the following :—

Lh. <i>e-mê</i> adj. ripe.	L. <i>a-măn.</i>
<i>e-šü</i> adj. raw.	<i>a-ŷu.</i>
<i>e-he<sup>n</sup></i> ; <i>e-ke</i> adj. old.	<i>a-gan.</i>
<i>e-lâ<sup>n</sup></i> adj. new.	<i>a-tsum.</i>

### 3. Directive Elements

§ 152. The language is better equipped with these before the verb than is usual in this region. As against the earlier

<sup>1</sup> Lhôtâ and Kachin likewise share the same replacement pronoun in Series III, Lh. *ši* this, *či* that ; K. *ši* for the independent 3rd person.

<sup>2</sup> *â-o* to weigh.

type of language, where they appear as infixes, they here stand alone as prefixes.

*trô-*, *trê-* indicate direction "to or into" (a town or other centre). They are vowel harmony forms, and occur as follows:—

*trô-wô* to go in or into (*wô* = to go).

*trê-yî* to go or come in, to enter in (*yî* = to go or come).

This is the same element as the infix *-trô-*, *trê-* following the verb (§ 154).

*čî-* indicates direction "out, away, forth" (from the centre at which the person is speaking or acting).

*čî-yî* to go out, to go away.

This is the same as the infix *-čî-* after the root (§ 154).

*čû-*, *šun-*, *e-nyi-* indicate contact "against" (with or without motion). From *kâ-tâ*<sup>1</sup> we thus have:—

*yuñ-â-wô* . . . . *čû-kâ-tâ* ran . . . . against (a fence).

*šun-kâ-tâ*<sup>2</sup> to throw against.

*e-nyi-kâ-tâ* to lean against.

*čûñ-* signifies direction "upwards".

*čûñ-wô* to climb up.

*čô-* indicates direction "downwards".

*čô-rô* to come down, to descend (*rô* = to come).

This particle also carries a general sense of escape, and is perhaps related to T. *ačor-ba*, P. *šor* to drop from; to escape, to slip away. It is the same element as the infix *-čô-* after the root (§ 154).

Though normally repeating a case suffix, as in e.g. *hî-čô puñ-lân-î-nâ čô-rô-čô* He came down (*čô-*) from (*-nâ*) the mountain, these elements not infrequently refer back to a preceding plain root substantive which they thus characterize as being in the corresponding case, as in *â-nâ Wô-ke čûñ-wô* I will go up to (*čûñ-*) Wokha (nom.). Sometimes, even, the whole objective idea will be carried by such an element, as in *â-nâ Wô-ke-nâ trê-yî-čô* I came in hither (*trê-* objective, otherwise omitted) from Wokha.

<sup>1</sup> Presumably so divided. Witter (*Lhôtâ Nâgâ Grammar*, p. 49, § 5, *et passim*) writes *kâtâ*. I have been unable to place this root. Witter's designation of it as a "common verbal form . . . signifying contact" is hardly satisfactory. Perhaps it is composed of a root *kâ* of "arrival" or "attainment" + *tâ* "together" (§ 153). Compare, on the other hand, *Āo -ket-* "up on to" (§ 142).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the writing *šaň-kâ-tâ* (Witter, *Gr.*, p. 152). Is *šaň* = *Āo á-taň* to hurl, to fling, to throw?



(b) *Elements Standing after the Root*

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 153. Among these are the following :—

*-lân-*, *-lâm-* with repetitive force = “ again ”, or (with verbs of motion), “ back again.”

*rô* to come, *rô-lân-* to come again (or, back again), to return.

*tsô* to eat, *tsô-lâm-* to eat again.

It corresponds to Angami *-lâ-*, Lushei *-lê-* (§ 205 (3)), Kôm *-lê-*, and others.

*-tâ-* with reciprocal force = “ one another ”, or frequently “ together ”.

*e-čûn* to join, *e-čûn-tâ-* to join together.

*wô* to join, *wô-tâ-* to join together.

*n-zü* to mix, *n-zü-tâ-* to mix together.

*lâm* to love, *lâm-tâ-* to love one another.

It corresponds to Ao *-tep-* (§ 141).

*-kân-* with completive force = “ all ”.

*tsô* to eat, *tsô-kân-* to eat up everything.

It is equivalent to Burmese *-kun-* “ wholly ” (§ 219), a root found in Tibetan as *kun* all, every, whole (= Bur. *a-kun*, fr. *kun* to be completed).

2. Directive Infixes

§ 154. With directive value we have :—

*-trô-*, *trû-*, *-tryu-* with the force of convergence “ to or into a centre ”.

*kî-ô-trô-* (or *kyô-trô-* ?) to gather.

*sâr-trû-* to gather together (in the hand).

*sân-tryu-* to assemble, to congregate.

It is the same as the prefix *trô-*, *trê-* (§ 152).

*-čô-* indicating motion “ downwards ”.

*len-čô-* to drop or fall down, to drip (as water).

*zân-čô-*<sup>1</sup> to drop or fall down, to drip (as water).

It is the same as the prefix *čô-* (§ 152).

*-čî-*<sup>2</sup> with the force of “ out, away, forth ”.

*sen-čî-* to push away.

*szam-čî-* to throw or hurl away (from one).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ao *zen-ok*, v. § 142, s.v. *-ok*.

<sup>2</sup> The infixes *-kâ-čî-* upwards, *-čô-čî-* downwards, used after the root with the Imperative of the verb *ze* to look (v. Witter, *Gr.* 48), both contain this element. *-čô-* is the same as the infix *-čô-* of this section.

It is the same as the prefix *či-* (§ 152), and, probably, as *Âo -ši-* (§ 142).

### 3. The Causative Infix *-tôk-*

§ 155. The causative infix following the verb is *-tôk-* (= *Âo -dâk (-tsa)*, § 143), and is probably the same root as Tibetan *aʃug-pa*, P. *bčug*, F. *gžug*, Imp. *čug* to cause, to compel. Both are used exactly the same way: Lh. *tsô-tôk* = T. *za-r aʃug-pa* to cause to eat.

## THE SUBSTANTIVE

### *Elements Standing before the Root*

#### 1. *m-, n-*

§ 156. The old prefix *m-, n-* with substantives, as in *Âo*, cannot be separated by its form from *m-, n-* with verbs, but is doubtless to be so separated.

As against *Âo me-, mo-, mu-*, it is not usually preceded by any other younger element, but still appears alone, and shows consonantal harmony, as does *m-, n-* with the verb (§ 149), as against the vowel harmony of *Âo*.

It appears with the same categories of substantives as does the *Âo* prefix and Tibetan *m-*, among others the following parts of the human body:—

Lh. <i>m-po</i>	foot	<i>Âo te-mo-po</i>	
<i>m-mâ</i>	stomach		
<i>n-te<sup>n</sup></i>	liver	<i>te-me-sen</i>	T. <i>mčîn-pa</i>
<i>n-ko</i>	knee	<i>te-mo-kok</i>	
<i>n-nâ</i>	navel		
<i>n-čü</i>	saliva	<i>me-tsa</i>	<i>mčil-ma</i>
<i>n-čâ</i>	spittle		
<i>n-lî, n-nî</i>	tongue <sup>1</sup>	<i>te-me-li</i>	

#### 2. *ô-* of Series II

§ 157. This prefix, which nearly every substantival root can assume except when preceded by a personal pronoun in the 1st or 2nd person, represents the root in Series A of §§ 147 and 148, and is probably an old demonstrative pronoun. Thus we may have *ô-kî* house (independent), or *ši ô-kî* his house, but *nî kî* your house and *â kî* my house, dispense with the prefix.

<sup>1</sup> See § 149, n. (p. 146).

In the dual the language still retains *ô-* in full and conscious use, employing *nî* (fr. *e(n)-nî* two) preceded by *ô-*. Thus *ši nâ á tá ô-nî* lit. He and my brother they (*ô-*) (being) two, i.e. He and my brother; *á tá-tô nâ nî nûi-tô ô-nî* lit. My elder brother and your younger brother they (*ô-*) (being) two, i.e. My elder brother and your younger brother.

When, on the contrary, the subject is in the 1st or 2nd person, *ô-* is naturally not employed, and we have *ši e nî* lit. He we (the) two, i.e. We (he and I).

Apart from the dual usage, *ô-* even appears sometimes in the singular in its original sense of "his, her, its" (genitive by position), as in: *nî yân-ôô ô-kî kôt-á-lá* lit. Your village in, its houses how many are? i.e. How many houses are there in your village? *á tá nâ ši ô-tá* My brother and his brother.

From this original use as a link prefix, *ô-* has naturally become permanently attached to those substantives which most frequently employed it, as, for instance, to parts of the human body, and corresponds to similar vocalic prefixes<sup>1</sup> of Series II elsewhere. In *Âo*, where Series II is missing,<sup>2</sup> the same function is performed by *te-* of Series I, as follows:—

Lh. <i>ô-paŋ</i>	<i>Âo te-bân</i>	mouth.
<i>ô-kê</i>	<i>te-ká</i>	hand.
<i>o-ôô</i>	<i>te-tsuŋ</i>	leg.
<i>ô-mýek</i>	<i>te-nuk, te-nak</i>	eye.
<i>ô-pôk</i>	<i>te-pok</i>	belly.
<i>ô-rô</i>	<i>te-ret</i>	bone.

Sometimes *e-* appears for *ô-*, as in:—

Lh. <i>e-wô<sup>n</sup></i>	<i>Âo. te-ben</i>	arm.
<i>e(n)-nô</i>	<i>te-nâ-roŋ</i>	ear.
<i>e-tô</i>	<i>te-za</i>	vein.
<i>e-nû</i>		neck.

These are perhaps taken over from the verbal usage (v. § 151), a supposition which seems to be supported by such forms as *e-pf'ú*, *Âo te-á-pu-bân* (*tá-pu-bân*) shoulder, *e-po*, *Âo te-á-pok* (*tá-pok*) hole, as these exhibit the equation Lh. *e-* = *Âo á-*.

The last case (Lh. *e-po*, *Âo te-á-pok*) is, indeed, probably descended directly from a former verb Lh. *e-po(k)*, *Âo á-pok*,

<sup>1</sup> Râbhâ *ô* that (also "he") is perhaps the same element, and Râbhâ *i* this, Lhôtâ *e-* (v., however, above, §§ 101 and 102).

<sup>2</sup> See § 104, table.



The 3rd personal element *lá* is really a demonstr. root<sup>1</sup> "that" replacing the old guttural element, once independent, of § 162.

The two forms *î-*, *ê-* of the 1st pers. plur. prefix are probably the result of vowel harmony though they are by no means always used this way. An example (fr. Stack and Lyall, *op. cit.*, 107) is as follows: *Mai! ăn-lê á-lăn ê-ke-čô-bei-rá, ê-reñ ê-kâ-pe-sô, á-pu-tăk-tă ê-hem î-rît ê-pâ-čê-kei-koi* "Oh! so much he us having cheated, our skins he has caused to smart, over and above that our houses (and) our fields he has caused us to set fire to and burn up".

### § 159. DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

*lá-băn-so* "this"      *há-lá*; *há-lá-băn-so* "that"

## THE VERB

### (a) Elements Standing before the Root

#### 1. *in-* of Series 0

§ 160. This prefix,<sup>2</sup> which, together with directive *-r(ár-)*, belongs in the oldest stratum of the language, is related before verbs to *Āo me-*, *Lhôtâ m-*, *n-*, to which it directly corresponds in the following instances.

M.

*in-nek* to laugh, to smile.

*in-nim* to smell, to be odorous.

*in-lek* to lick, to lap.

*in-tok* to spit (also spittle).

*in-tăk* to itch.

*Āo me-na.*

*Āo me-nem.*

*Āo me-zak*, Lh. *m-yák.*

*Āo me-năk.*

*Āo me-tsa me-tsa (me-tsa spittle), Lh. n-čôk (n-čă spittle).*

*Āo me-săk*, Lh. *e-n-tăk.*

and the LSI., and the forms *ăn-*, *kăn-*, *păn-*, *čăn-* (written with the long Bengali *á* অ) are analysed into their components *á-in*, *ká-in*, *pá-in*, *čé-á-in* respectively (see LSI., iii, 2, p. 382, where, however, *čăn-* is apparently regarded as the same as *čîn-*, and is consequently analysed into *čé-in*, taking no account of the *-á-* component).

<sup>1</sup> Stack and Lyall, *The Mikirs*, pp. 79 and 161.

<sup>2</sup> Mikir orthography is sometimes a little confusing here, the *n* of the prefix having absorbed the initial. Accordingly *in-rap* to winnow, should probably be reconstructed to *in-nrap* (< *in-grap*), in view of Tibetan *akrab-pa*, P. *bkrab* (?); *ăn-ar* is probably really *á-in-nar* in agreement with Tăngkhul (*kă-)**nar*, T. *snur-ba* to snore, *nur-ba* to grunt; *in-lu* to bathe, really *in-nlu* in view of T. *ăkru-ba*, *ăkrud-pa*, P. *bkrus*, F. *bkru*, Dim. *gru*.

## M.

- in-lum* to be thick or dense (in *kǎn-lum* = *kâ-in-lum* thick).     *Âo me-lem* id. (in *te-me-lem* thick).
- in-tun* to join. (*kǎn-tun* = *kâ-in-tun* id.)     *Âo me-sen(-tep)*.
- in-sip* to suck up, to absorb.     *Âo me-sep* to absorb.
- in-tip(-čet)* to cut, to trim, to nibble.     *Âo me-tep* to nibble.
- in-tui* to be high.     Lh. *n-tsôn* (in *n-tsôn-â* high).
- in-čim* to come to a point, to be pointed.     Lh. *n-zen* to sharpen to a point.
- in-săm* to be or become cold.     Lh. *m-yim* (in *m-yim-â* cold).
- in-roñ* to roar, to trumpet.     Lh. *n-rôn* to bellow.
- in-sok* to comb, to brush.     Lh. *n-šák*, *Âo me-sa*.
- in-juṣ* to imbibe, to absorb.     Lh. *n-tsap*, *Âo me-sep (-ket)* to suck.
- in-hum* to bend, to warp.     Lh. *n-kû(-tēt)* to bend.

We may also deduce the following :—

## M.

- in-som* to be heaped up (in *ǎn-som* = *â-in-som* crowd, heap, pile; *pǎn-som* = *pâ-in-som* vb. caus. to pile up).     Cf. Lh. *n-ša* subst. heap, pile.
- in-deñ* to be confined, bounded, or enclosed (in *ǎn-deñ* = *â-in-deñ* subst. boundary, apartment, room).     Cf. Lh. *n-čēñ* subst. apartment, room.
- in-ṣok* to pierce, to sting (in *čǎn-ṣok* = *če-â-in-ṣok* to sting).     Cf. *Âo me-ták* to sting.

*in-* is equivalent to Tibetan *m-* in :—

## M.

- in-tui* to be high.
- in-nim* to smell (intr.).
- in-ček* to rebuke, to scold.
- in-tun* to adjoin, to be together.

## T.

- mto-ba*, *mton-po*.
- mnam-pa*.
- mtsog-pa*; also *atsog-pa*, P. *btsags*, F. *btsog*, Imp. *tsog*.
- mtun-pa* (also *atun-pa*) to harmonize, to be in agreement.

Many other cases probably lie concealed by semantic change.

*in-tik* to be united, to be joined, deducible from *ā-in-tik(-pet)* devoted, dutiful, *ā-in-t'ik(-fot)* integrity; incorruptible, *ā-in-t'ik (-dut)* chaste, faithful, is evidently to be linked with Tibetan *mkrig-ma* wrist, a form which, as we have seen in § 26, is probably a lapse from an original inactive intransitive verb, to be united, to be joined.<sup>1</sup>

*in-ran* to spread (as a fire) preserves an intransitive form probably originally existing in Tibetan (\**mkrēm*?) beside the transitive *agrem(s)-pa*, P. *bkram*, F. *dgram*, Imp. *kroms* to spread out, to display.

*in-kuñ* to bend (intr.), to be flexible, deducible from *ān-kuñ* (= *ā-in-kuñ*) elbow, probably has its Tibetan connections in *koñ*, *koñs* crooked, bent, *agoñ-ba*, P. *bkoñ* to bewitch, to enchant, probably originally "to bend a person's will by means of magic" (cf. *dpa bkoñ-ba*, *-goñ-ba*, *-kkoñ-ba*, *-bsgoñ-ba* to dishearten, to discourage, lit. to bend another's courage (*dpa*)). All trace of a Tibetan form in *m-* with a sense of "to be bent, to be discouraged", which one might expect to find, is now lacking.

In view of Mikir's affinity with the Nāgā-Kuki languages (v. § 158. n. 1) the following correspondences with Tāngkhul *na-*, *ma-*, are of interest:—

M.	Tāng.
<i>pā-in-rum</i> ( <i>pāñ-rum</i> ) ( <i>in-rum</i> to come together).	( <i>ka-)</i> <i>na-rum</i> to add.
<i>in-nim</i> ( <i>ā-in-nim</i> ( <i>āñ-nim</i> ) odour)	( <i>ka-)</i> <i>na-nam</i> to smell. ( <i>na-nam</i> odour).
<i>pā-in-o</i> ( <i>pāñ-o</i> ).	( <i>ka-)</i> <i>na-hai</i> to hurt, to injure.
<i>in-lek</i> .	( <i>ka-)</i> <i>ma-lek</i> to lick.
<i>in-nek</i> .	( <i>ka-)</i> <i>ma-na</i> to laugh, to smile.
<i>in-se</i> (in <i>āñ-se</i> empty).	( <i>ka-)</i> <i>ma-sai</i> to be empty.

Cross correspondences occur here with *Āo ā-* in:—

M.	Āo
<i>kā-in-roñ</i> ( <i>kāñ-roñ</i> ) to howl.	<i>ā-roñ</i> to howl.
<i>in-vui</i> to stir, to mix.	<i>ā-ei(-ši)</i> id.
<i>in-tan</i> to cut up, to carve.	<i>ā-ten</i> to cut.

<sup>1</sup> Further ramifications of this root occur in Mikir *tik* to arrange, to settle; certain, justice, *pe-tik* to arrange (caus.), *ā-tik(-pet)* just, strict, definite (cf. Dim. *tik* accurate, correct). In addition to the forms given in § 26 there is also CT. *kriḡ-kriḡ* (pr. *frik-frik*) accurate, sure.

Equivalence of Mikir *t* with Tibetan guttural with *ra-tag* occurs again in M. *típ* to create, to make T. *sgrub-pa*, P. *bsgrubs*, F. *bsgrub*, Imp. *sgrubs*, where the *i* <> *u* equivalence also occurs (v. § 117).

Possibly also M. *in-taṇ* hard, solid is T. *mkran(-ba)*, though a relative of this Tibetan word i.e. *agran-ba* to satiate, to stuff with food (lit. ? to make swollen and hard by filling; cf. *skran-ba*, P. *bskrans* to become swollen and hard) retains in Mikir *in-kran* to fill the stomach, the guttural with *r*.

Likewise cross correspondences with Lhôtâ *e*- occur in :—

M.	Lh.
<i>in-nim</i> .	<i>e-n̄u</i> to smell (intr.).
<i>in-pai</i> to fence round.	<i>e-pi</i> to enclose.
<i>in-hu</i> .	<i>e-fû</i> to steal, to rob.
<i>in-reñ</i> .	<i>e-rôn</i> to bleat, to chirp.

To Tibetan *b*-, *a*-, cross correspondences occur in :—

M.	T.
<i>in-krañ</i> to fill (the stomach), to be filled.	<i>agrañ-ba</i> to satisfy (with food), to satiate.
<i>in-bo</i> to be or become lost.	<i>abud-pa</i> , P. <i>abud</i> to dis- appear, to pass from sight.
<i>in-fañ</i> to elapse, to pass by (of time).	<i>ada-ba</i> , P. <i>adas</i> id.
<i>in-ñir</i> to melt (intr. and tr.).	<i>añu-ba</i> <sup>1</sup> P. <i>bžus</i> , F. <i>bzu</i> id.
<i>in-hum</i> to bend (intr. and tr.).	<i>agum-pa</i> , P. <i>gum</i> id. (tr.).
<i>in-pu</i> to open.	<i>abu-ba</i> , P. <i>abus</i> to open.
<i>in-lek</i> <sup>2</sup> to lick.	<i>ldag-pa</i> , P. <i>bldags</i> , F. <i>bldag</i> , Imp. <i>ldog</i> id.
<i>in-hap</i> <sup>3</sup> to close, to shut. (Also subst. door, gate, lid.)	<i>agebs-pa</i> , P. <i>bkab</i> , F. <i>dgab</i> , Imp. <i>kob</i> to cover up, to put on (a lid or cover), <i>akeb-pa</i> , P. <i>kebs</i> to cover.
<i>in-ñar</i> to bloom, to blossom (deducible from <i>â-in-ñar</i> flower, head of flowers).	<i>abar-ba</i> to bloom, to blossom.
<i>in-krak</i> to be open, to gape apart (deducible from <i>â-in-krak</i> opening, gap).	<i>bgrad-pa</i> to open wide (as the eyes), to set apart (as the legs). (v. § 56.)
<i>in-rap</i> (= <i>in-nrap</i> ?) <sup>4</sup> to winnow.	<i>akrab-pa</i> , P. <i>bkrab</i> (?) id.
<i>in-vei</i> to fly round (as insects).	<i>añur-pa</i> , P. <i>ñur</i> to fly. (Cf. Bâ. <i>bîr</i> .)
	<i>añar-ba</i> to fly up (of sparks), to splash up (of water).
<i>in-lu</i> (= <i>in-nlu</i> ?) <sup>4</sup> to bathe.	<i>akru-ba</i> , <i>akrud-pa</i> , P. <i>bkrus</i> , F. <i>bkru</i> id.

<sup>1</sup> The final of the Tibetan root appears to have been *-n* (v. § 55). The *i* < > *u* interchange is normal (§ 117).

<sup>2</sup> For M. *l* = T. *ld*. Cf. *in-lan*, T. *ldin-ba* to float.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also *â-kup* cover, lid. For the weakening of the initial, compare Kachin *ma-kâp*, *ma-nâp* to cover, *ma-gap* a lid, a cover (from *gap* to be covered), which further shows direct correspondence of prefix with Mikir.

<sup>4</sup> See § 160, n. 2.



M.	T.
<i>in-sip</i> <sup>1</sup> to suck in, to inhale, to absorb, to soak up.	<i>aʃib(s)-pa</i> , P. <i>bʒibs</i> , F. <i>bʒib</i> .
<i>in-ʃup</i> <sup>1</sup> to imbibe, to absorb.	
<i>in-ʃoi</i> , <i>in-ʃui</i> to drop, to fall (as water).	<i>ačor-ba</i> , P. <i>šor</i> to drop from ; to escape, to slip away.
<i>kā-in-hor</i> ( <i>kǎn-hor</i> ) to bear, to carry (a burden).	<i>ačur-ba</i> , P. and F. <i>kur</i> , rarely <i>bkur</i> id. ; <i>ačyer-ba</i> , P. <i>ačyer</i> id.
<i>kā-in-ʃui</i> ( <i>kǎn-ʃui</i> ) to fall.	<i>ačor-ba</i> , P. <i>šor</i> id.
<i>kā-in-hu</i> ( <i>kǎn-hu</i> ) to steal.	<i>rku-ba</i> , P. ( <i>b</i> ) <i>rkus</i> , F. <i>brku</i> , Imp. <i>rkus</i> id.
<i>če-ā-in-ʃok</i> ( <i>čǎn-ʃok</i> ) to sting.	<i>aɖzugs-pa</i> , P. <i>btsugs</i> , F. <i>gzugs</i> , Imp. <i>zug(s)</i> id.

Semantic change probably conceals many other cases. At the base of *kǎn-toñ* (*kā-in-toñ*), *in-toñ* deaf, is probably a verb allied to Tibetan *aɖoñ*, *doñ* gone (Perfect of *aɖoñ-ba* to go), which appears again in Lepcha *a-ñor sǔn-toñ* deaf, lit. "gone or extinct ((*sǔn*)-*toñ*, T. *doñ*) ear".

Very rarely *in-* corresponds to Tibetan *g-*, as in, *in-sek*, T. *gšeg-pa*, *gšag-pa* to tear (v., also, § 180 *inf.*).

§ 161. In general, in conformity with what appears to be its basic nature, subjective, and primarily, like Tibetan *m-*, associated with intransitive verbs, *in-* shows a tendency to connect itself with subjective or reflexive action, or, in other words, with verbal concepts which lay more especial stress upon the subjective relation.

It seems almost certain that it is related to the reflexive infix *-in-* of Central Chin (Lai and Lushei, v. § 204) and several of the Old Kuki languages, and as it is an important link with these (also for completeness's sake, since we shall later have occasion to take together Mikir *-r-* and Old Kuki *-rr-*, *-ra-*, *-rā-*, *-ro-* ; v. § 165), we may consider here the probable connection between Mikir *in-* and *in-* of the Old Kuki group.<sup>2</sup>

Among the languages of that group, Hallâm, Hrângkhol, Langrong, and Kôm (especially the first) possess this element

<sup>1</sup> For the *i* <> *u* interchange, see § 117.

<sup>2</sup> These languages are of special interest in showing many points in common with the Nâgâ and Nâgâ-Bodo groups, notably among others, the use of the 3rd personal pronominal prefix *ka-* as against *a-* of Kuki-Chin, and the negative suffix *-māk*, *-má* as against *-lo* in Central Chin, their nearest relatives (v. LSI. iii, 3, pp. 9, 181). Comparison with them is instituted here, as it throws considerable light upon Mikir. (See again § 165 *inf.*)

*in-* frequently with verbs of the same, or closely related, meaning, as those with which Mikir *in-* occurs.

Thus we find : Kôm *in-čún-yô-hai* joined himself (to him) (LSI. iii, 3, p. 250) with which compare Mikir *in-tun* to join ; Hallâm *in-čâm-in* from being hungry (I die) (*op. cit.*, 201), cf. Mikir *in-čir* to feel hunger ; Kôm *in-rî-yô-â* he said to himself (*op. cit.*, 250), cf. Mikir *čîn-ki* ( = *či-in-ki*) to converse with.

These languages have, unlike Mikir, to some degree, held the use of this element away from association with the infix *-r-*, so that only one language uses both, so far as one can judge from the material offered in the Linguistic Survey.

Thus in the following cases Chiru, Kolhreng, and Hirôi-Lamgâng, laying more especial stress upon the objective relation of the verb, employ the infixed directive element *-r-*, *-rr-*, *-ro-*, where Kôm, Hallâm, and Hrângkhol use the subjective *in-*.

Thus Kôm has *in-čún-yô-hai* joined himself (to him) (*op. cit.*, 250), but Chiru *a-r-čún-yoi* he joined (him) (*op. cit.*, 231), Kolhreng *an-ki(y)-a-r-čún-yai* he joined (together with him) (*op. cit.*, 240), Hirôi-Lamgâng (*wâ-)**ka-rr-do-lam-dâ* (going) he joined (him) (*op. cit.*, 288). Again Hallâm has *in-tai-kâ-tî*, or *in-toi-kâ-tî-â* I will arise I declare (*op. cit.*, pp. 199, 201), but Kolhreng *a-kê-rr-tê-yâ* he arising (*op. cit.*, 240), while against Hrângkhol *en-rût-tâ* he heard (*op. cit.*, 189), Chiru sets *a-ro-ŋet* he heard (*op. cit.*, 232).

In Hallâm *in-dâi-nâ* rejoicing (among ourselves) (*op. cit.*, 200), *in-nui-in-dâi-ei-ti-ui* merry and glad (amongst ourselves) let us be (*op. cit.*, 202, 203), and Langrong *in-dâi-nâ* joyful (among ourselves) (*op. cit.*, 212) *in-* is equivalent as a subjective element to Tibetan *b-* before the same root, T. *bde-ba* to be glad, happy, joyous.

## 2. *ke-*, *ki-*, *kâ-* of Series I

§ 162. The old pronominal prefix with verbal noun derivatives (adjs., etc.) is here *ke-*, *ki-*, *kâ-* of Series I.

<i>ke-tê</i>	great, large.
<i>ki-dîn</i>	long, tall.
<i>ke-ho</i>	bitter.
<i>ke-dok</i>	sweet.

This prefix differs from its relatives in the Bodo languages in being separable, often standing before *pe-* of the causative,

as in e.g. *kâ-pe-tî* "the killing", fr. *pe-tî* vb. caus. to kill (*tî* vb. intr. to die), and *in-* as in e.g. *kăn-tin* (= *kâ-in-tin*) "being dark" fr. *in-tin* vb. intr. to be dark.

### 3. *â-* of Series II

§ 163. A younger element *â-* of Series II is also frequent with verbal noun derivatives (adjectival and substantival), and occurs sometimes prefixed to *ke-*, *ki-*, giving compound forms *â-ke-*, *â-ki-*, just as in Semâ Nâgâ, or prefixed alone to the root which it thus originally linked in 3rd personal relationship to a preceding possessor.

Among others are, (a) with *-ke-*, *-ki-*.

*â-ke-ve* adj. green, unripe, immature, raw.

*â-ke-čam* green, unripe, immature, raw.

*â-ke-ŋoi* inferior, causeless, fruitless. Cf. Semâ *â-ke-sâ* adj. bad.

*â-ke-er* red (✓ *er* as in *er-doñ* adj. red).

*â-ke-oñ* excessive (*ke-oñ* adj. many).

*â-ki-mi* new.

*â-ke-ŋut* subst. end, finality.

(b) Standing alone, e.g. in :—

*â-sot* adj. honest, holy. *â-ŋeñ-so* adj. small.

*â-roñ* delightful. *â-tik* just.

*â-ve* absent. *â-ve-rem* scanty.

*â-so* young. *â-bân* old (of things).

*â-dur* subst. disposition. *â-duk* subst. crime.

*â-ron* custom. *â-ri* companion.

*â-se* noise. *â-tit*<sup>1</sup> knot.

*â-hoi* limit. *â-ren* line.

As the last link prefix still in use, it also naturally precedes other elements such as *-in-* and *-r-*, e.g. *ăn-se* (*â-in-se*) vacant, *ăn-deñ* (*â-in-deñ*) limit, *â-r-nan* link, etc., etc.

### 4. The Directive Infix *-r-*

§ 164. The element *-r-* occurring as an infix<sup>2</sup> after the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tibetan *mdud-pa* knot (also its cognates in § 26). The *i : u* vowel relation of § 117 occurs again here.

<sup>2</sup> That sometimes it is really the root initial, appears from comparison with cognates in other languages. Thus *kâr-om* warm, is more correctly *kâ-rom* as shown by T. *dron(-mo)*, K. *lum*, Lh. *e-lam-â*, etc.; *âr-e* dew, is really *â-re* in agreement with K. *mā-ri*, Dîmā-sâ *ra-bām-di*, etc. In *âr-pek* broom, we perhaps have a synonym compound: *âr* = T. *ol(-mo)* broom, *pek* = T. *pyag(-ma)* broom.

pronominal prefix  $\hat{a}$ -<sup>1</sup> before a number of verbs, is almost certainly connected with the Tibetan directive infix  $-r$ .<sup>2</sup>

As will appear in the sequel, there is evidence in the Old Kuki group where this infix occurs again (as  $-r$ -,  $-ra$ -,  $-r\hat{a}$ -,  $-ro$ -), that it was originally vocalized.

Its original force, which appears to have been locative or dative with such meanings as "in, into, to, towards", also receives interesting light from the same source. The passage already quoted from Maring (v. § 97) illustrates how originally it repeated in the verb a locative or dative suffix ( $-ro$  or  $-r\hat{a}$ )<sup>3</sup> attached to the object.

Direct correspondences with Tibetan  $-r$  occur in :—

M.	T.
<i>pe-â-r-lo</i> ( <i>pâr-lo</i> ) to overthrow, to turn over. (Caus. in <i>pe-</i> fr. <i>â-r-lo</i> to be overthrown.)	<i>rlog-pa</i> , P. <i>brlags</i> . F. <i>brlag</i> , Imp. <i>rlog(s)</i> to overthrow, to destroy (vb. caus.).
<i>pe-â-r-deñ</i> ( <i>pâr-deñ</i> ) to rap, to knock. (Caus. of <i>â-r-deñ</i> to be struck.)	<i>rduñ-ba</i> , P. <i>brduñs</i> , F. <i>brduñ</i> , Imp. ( <i>b</i> ) <i>rduñ(s)</i> to beat, to strike, to smite. <i>rdegs-pa</i> , P. ( <i>b</i> ) <i>rdegs</i> , F. <i>brdeg</i> , Imp. ( <i>b</i> ) <i>rdeg(s)</i> to beat, to strike, to smite.
<i>â-r-ŷu</i> to ask, to inquire.	<i>rŷod-pa</i> , P. and F. <i>brŷod</i> to say, to pronounce, to propound. <i>žu-ba</i> , P. <i>žus</i> to request, to petition, to ask.
<i>â-r-ke</i> to scratch, to scrape, to dig with the foot (as fowls the earth).	<i>rko-ba</i> , P. ( <i>b</i> ) <i>rkos</i> , F. <i>brko</i> , Imp. <i>rkos</i> to dig, to gouge (the earth).

<sup>1</sup> It is only very rarely that it occurs with any other element preceding, but we find it with reflexive *či*- in *či-r-bak* to cling (lit. to cling to ( $-r$ -) one another (*či*-)), a form paralleling *â-r-bak* to cling to.

<sup>2</sup> An identification suggested in the case of certain substantives by Lyall (v. Stack and Lyall, *The Mikirs*, p. 129, n. 1), but  $-r$  is not there directive.

<sup>3</sup> Though we cannot now isolate such an element in Mikir, it is possible that in *â-r-lo* into, we come nearest to being able to separate it out.  $-lo$  seems to = Semâ  $-lo$  in, into, to (whence *hi-lau* here, *hu-lao* there? Cf. M. *he-lo* adj. far, distant), and Dimâ-sâ  $-r\hat{a}$  (whence *i-r\hat{a}*, *e-r\hat{a}* here, *ô-r\hat{a}* there), and (*â*)- $r-lo$  can thus perhaps be regarded as a synonym compound,  $r$ -(*\*ra*) to, into +  $lo$  to, into. We can isolate a closely related locative (and dative) form  $ro$  in Chiru *a-ro-om* he was in (the field). In Empéo the dative verbal noun suffix  $-r\hat{a}$  is perhaps the same element.

## M.

*â-r-dep* to slap. }  
*â-r-tap* to throw. }

*â-r-kum* to creep.

*â-r-dik* to peep or look through.

*ke-â-r-nu* (*kâr-nu*) to fry.

## T.

*rdeb(s)-pa*, *rdab-pa*, P. *brdabs*,  
 F. *brdab*, to throw down  
 with a clap, to "slap"  
 down. (Cf. also *rdib-pa*,  
 P. *rdibs* to fall to pieces, to  
 break down, to be or be-  
 come dented or battered (as  
 a tin vessel)).

*rtib-pa*, P. *brtibs*, F. *brtib*,  
 Imp. *rtib(s)* to break or  
 pull down. (See also  
 § 139, *Âo â-tep*).

*rgyu-ba* to wander, to rove,  
 to range. (\**rgyun* as in  
*rgyun* subst. flow, current,  
 stream) (v. § 55).

*rtog-pa*, P. *brtags*, *brtag*, Imp.  
*rtog(s)* to consider, to  
 examine, to search into, to  
 look through.

*rñod-pa*, P. *brños*, F. *brñod*  
 (Cs., perh. erroneously,  
*brño*), Imp. *rñod*, *rños*.

In view of the probable directive value of the infix, it is  
 significant that it is well represented in the following classes  
 of verb.

(1) Verbs of Motion, generally with contact.

*âr-lu* to climb, to mount.

*âr-ŷap* to stand up.

*âr-dep* to slap.

*âr-nim* to soak, to steep.

*âr-plon* to run.

*âr-doñ* to swim upstream.

and the causatives:—

*pâr-deñ* to rap.

*pâr-lem* to twist.

*âr-kum* to creep.

*âr-bak* to cling to, to embrace.

*âr-dok* to sweep.

*âr-ke* to scratch at (as a bird  
the ground).

*âr-bu* to strike downwards.

*pâr-kup*, *pâr-lin* to invert  
 (only of vessels and other  
 containers).

*pâr-lo* to overthrow, to turn  
 over.

etc.

(2) Verbs of speaking, entreating, hearing, seeing, etc.

*âr-ju* to ask about, to inquire     *âr-dom*, *kâr-dom* (a) to  
concerning.     entreat, to pray to ; (b)  
to salute.

*âr-kli* to worship, to offer     *âr-ne* to invite, to call.  
reverence to.

*âr-ju* to hear, to listen to.     *âr-dik* to peep or look through  
(as a narrow crevice).

§ 165. The many facts adduced by Lyall<sup>1</sup> to show that the affinities of Mikir lie at least as much with the Kuki-Chin languages as with the Bodo group, receive an interesting addition from this prefix.

The Old Kuki languages Hallâm, Chiru, Kolhreng, and Hirôi-Lamgâng (particularly the second and last) possess it, in some cases in verbs of the same meaning as in Mikir.

Thus we find HL. *a-rr-bân-lût* to enter (he refused) (LSI. iii, 3, p. 289), cf. M. *â-r-lo-lut* to enter ; HL. *a-rr-pom-dâ* he embraced (him) (*loc. id.*) ; Chiru *ro-ko-to-wâ* embracing (him) (*op. cit.*, 231), cf. M. *â-r-bak* to embrace, to clasp ; Hallâm *â-r-kêl*, *â-râ-kel* he asked (him) (*op. cit.*, 200, 202, 205) ; Chiru *a-r-don* he asked (him) (*op. cit.*, 232), cf. M. *â-r-ju* to ask, to inquire, *â-r-dom* to entreat, to pray ; Chiru *a-ro-jêt* he heard (*op. cit.*, 232), cf. M. *â-r-ju* to hear.

It seems possible that here a related survival is found also in the dative and accusative substantival suffix *-rân* to, for, found in Hallâm and Chiru, and the dative verbal noun suffix *-rân* of Hrângkhol, Hallâm, Langrong, Chiru and Anâl, *-rañ* of Aimol and Hirôi-Lamgâng, *-ron* of Kolhreng, *-r'on* of Anâl, and *-ro* of Chiru, Kolhreng and Kôm (*v. LSI.*, iii, 3, § Old Kuki). The matter, however, is doubtful. The forms in most cases are too full to represent the same root as the prefix connected with Mikir and Tibetan *-r-*. Only in the last case (*-ro*) is the agreement in form with the Old Kuki infix close.

An especially interesting feature of the Old Kuki infix is that it is sometimes replaced by other elements which also possess relatives employed as dative particles following substantives.

Aimol and Kolhreng *-din-* (= a dative substantival suffix *-din* to, as in Chiru<sup>2</sup>) is such an element and in the following

<sup>1</sup> *The Mikirs*, pp. 151-72. See also § 158, n. 1 *sup.*

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps Hrângkhol *-tîn*, *-tên*, in, Aimol *-tiên*, *-tên*, *-tiañ*, Hmâr *-tiañ*, in, are also the same suffix (cf. Mikir *-dun* towards). Compare Ao § 142, Possibly the Langrong and Hmâr dative verbal noun suffix *-din* also belongs here.

replaces *-r-*, *-râ-* (see the same passages in Hallâm, above): Aimol *a-diñ-kêl-â* he asked (him) (LSI., iii, 3, p. 221), *a-diñ-kêl-yoi* she requested (him) (*op. cit.*, 224), Kolhreng *a-diñ-kêl-yai* he asked (him) (*op. cit.*, 241). It is possible that in *â-r-ju-diñ* to listen to, we have this element in Mikir also.

Similarly *-vâ-*, *-wa-*, a widely spread infix in Kuki-Chin derived from an old verb root "to go" is sometimes employed for the same purpose, as in: Hallâm *â-vâ-kol-â* he embracing (him) (*op. cit.*, 202), Kolhreng *a-wa-kol-â* he embracing (him) (*op. cit.*, 241), constructions paralleling the same phrase in *-rr-*, *-ro-* given above.

In Kôm *a-ga-kû-â* he embracing (him) (*op. cit.*, 251), we probably have another similar verb root *ga* to go.

Thus considering the almost certain identity of the infixes *-rr-*, *-râ-*, *-ro-* with Mikir *-r-*, it is not surprising that they are associated with the same classes of verb.

Placed under their respective heads the following completes the list of such Old Kuki constructions found in the Linguistic Survey (vol. iii, pt. 3).

#### 1. Verbs of Motion :—

Hirôi-Lamgâng *a-rr-bân-dâ*, *ka-rr-bân-dâ*, *ka-rr-bân-â* he has come, he came (*op. cit.*, 289), *ma-rr-wan-nâ* on his coming (*op. cit.*, 289), *ma-rra-wân-tân-tâ* upon his returning (*op. cit.*, 289), Kolhreng *a-kê-rr-fê-yâ* he arising (*op. cit.*, 240), Chiru *a-r-êñ-yoi* he joined (him) (*op. cit.*, 231), Kolhreng *an-ki(y)-a-r-êñ-yai* he joined (together with him) (*op. cit.*, 240), Hirôi-Lamgâng *wâ-ka-rr-do-lam-dâ* going he joined (him) (*op. cit.*, 288), *ka-rr-dâm-dâ* their dancing (*op. cit.*, 289).

#### 2. Verbs of Speaking and Entreating :—

Chiru *a-rû-ma-sân-yoi* he replied (to him) (*op. cit.*, 232), Hirôi-Lamgâng *a-rr-tân-dâ* he replied (to him) (*op. cit.*, 289, 291), with which compare Aimol *a-lai-sân-â* (*op. cit.*, 221).

#### 3. Miscellaneous Verbs embodying ideas of Direction :—

Chiru *a-ro-om* he was in (the field) (*op. cit.*, 232), Hirôi-Lamgâng *ka-di-ka-rr-hê-la* from his being dead (*op. cit.*, 289), *ka-kin-jê-rr-pa-dâ* he has become alive (or, come back to life) (*op. cit.*, 289).

#### 5. The Reflexive Infix *-çi-*, *-če-*

§ 166. This infix limits the verbal action to the sphere of the subject, and is employed to indicate that the subject performs the act himself in person, or suffers the act himself,

or (where the subject is plural) that its members act mutually upon one another or together for the same end, and similar ideas.

According to the sense required it may occur alone as a prefix, as a prefix preceding infixed *-in-*, *-r-*, *-pe-*, *-pî-*, *-pâ-*, or as an infix between *pe-*, *pî-*, *pâ-* and the root.

In these various positions it occurs in: *če-pu-lo* (they) said to one another, *čîn-tur-lo* (= *če-in-tur-lo*) (they) awoke one another, *čer-ju-lo* (= *če-r-ju-lo*) he (himself) asked privately, *če-pe-rê-te-kăn-sî* having instructed and left her behind, *pâ-či-tû-koi-lăn* he has caused us ourselves to slaughter every one (*-koi-*) (of our own cows).

#### 6. The Causative Element *pe-*, *pî-*, *pâ-*

§ 167. This is probably from the root *pî* to give, and may be exemplified in: *pe-ték* to cause to see, to show, from *ték* to see; *pe-tî* to cause to die, to kill, from *tî* to die; *pî-dîn* to lengthen, from *dîn* long; *pâ-tu* to hide, to conceal, from *tu* hidden, concealed.

In common with most of the other morphological elements of Mikir, it is separable as against the corresponding elements in the Bodo group, and appears before the element *-či-* in e.g. *pâ-či-tû* to cause one to kill something of one's own, and before *-in-* in, for instance, *păn-rum* (= *pâ-in-rum*) to collect, to bring together.

#### (b) Elements Standing after the Root

##### 1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 168. The language is rich in these. Among others are:—*pět-*, *-koi-*, *-klip-*, with completive force = all, every one.

*lut* to enter; *lut-pět-lo* (They) have all entered.

*lê* to arrive; *lê-koi-lo* (They) have all arrived.

*čô* to eat, to devour; *čô-klip-lo* (He) devoured them every one.

*ĵô-*, *-ĵăm-*, *-hur-*, *-hor-*, *-krei-*, *-proi-*, *-ron-*, all indicate a plural subject, their usual position being between the last adverbial infix and the tense index. Thus, e.g.:—

*in-ĵâr-dun-ět-ĵô-lo* They (*-ĵô-* plur.) flew up (*in-ĵâr* . . . *lo*) gracefully (*-ět-*) all together (*-dun-*). (HK. 132.)<sup>1</sup>

*tû-* of repetition = adv. again (cf. Gârô *-tai-*, § 131).

*năn-kăt-tû-voi-lo* (He) ran back there again (HK. 131).

*âr-ju-tû-lê-lo* (They) asked again.

<sup>1</sup> HK. = "The Story of Hârâtâ Kunwar" in Stack and Lyall, *The Mikirs*, pp. 113–50.



-*rǎn-rǎn-* of continuance with the force of “continually”.  
*ǰô-dun-rǎn-rǎn-lo* (He) continually kept bending (his bow) (HK. 142).

-*pǒn-* of accompaniment, has the force of “with, together”.  
*in-ǰâr-pǒn-lo* Flew up with (him). (HK. 145.)  
*in-ǰâr-pǒn-ět-ǰô* Flew away gracefully (-*ět-*) together. (HK. 129.)

-*dǒk-dǒk-* = adv. almost, nearly.  
*hem-lê-ǰî-dǒk-dǒk-lo* (When he) had almost arrived home. (HK. 139.)

-*ǰîn-* indicates that the verbal action was accomplished “gradually”.  
*in-sǎm-ǰîn-lo* (The day) gradually became cool. (HK. 124.)

It is probably related to T. *čam-me* by degrees, gradually.

-*dun-* indicates accompaniment, and carries the sense of “together”. It is really an old verb root *dun* to go or be with another, and is evidently cognate to the same root in T. *mdun-ma* wife, she with whom one is united, and its cognates (v. § 55 *sup.*). For its use, see -*ǰô-* above.

-*ět-* indicates grace or charm in the action designated by the verb, as in :—

*in-ǰâr-ět-dǎn-lo* (She) flew away (*in-ǰâr . . . lo*) gracefully (-*ět-*) back whence she came (-*dǎn-*).

Though usually stated to be the substantive *ět* yellow,<sup>1</sup> it is very probable that this root should be connected with T. < *od* light, brightness; luminous, beautiful, splendid, stately.

Finally we have what appear to be onomatopoeic particles, in :—

-*bup-*, *dǎp-*, *-dup-*, probably in imitation of the thud of a falling body, used with verbs of striking, or falling.

-*dǎp-*, *-dup-* may be related to *â-r-dep* to slap (T. *rdeb(s)-pa*, *rdab-pa*, etc., v. § 164).

## 2. Directive Infixes

§ 169. The following are possibly directive in force :—

-*łǝt-* used with : *lut* to enter, *ǰǝk*, *vâr* to throw, and possibly indicate motion into. (Cf. ? *Âo -dǎk*, *-tǎk*, § 142.)

-*lǝt-* used with *lî* to die, *î* to lie down, *ǰân* to close the eyes.

So in Stack and Lyall, *op. cit.*, p. 124, note.

## THE SUBSTANTIVE

*Elements Standing before the Root*1. *in-*

§ 170. *in-* with substantives is undoubtedly different from *in-* with verbs, just as *m-* is in Tibetan (cf. also §§ 144, 156).

Like this last, it occurs before a certain number of substantives belonging to definite categories.

Thus among those: (1) indicating parts of the human body, we have, corresponding directly to Tibetan *m-* :—

M. <i>in-tin</i> ( <i>â-in-tin</i> )	liver.	T. <i>mčîn-pa</i> .
<i>in-tur</i>	lip.	<i>mčû</i> .
<i>in-tok</i>	} spittle	<i>mčil-ma</i> .
<i>in-te</i>		
<i>in-kroi</i> ( <i>â-in-kroi</i> )		

Also among those without Tibetan corresponding prefix :—

<i>in-ho</i>	mouth.	<i>in-om</i> <sup>1</sup>	cheek.
<i>in-mi</i> ( <i>â-in-mi</i> )	hair (of the body).	<i>in-mum</i>	beard, whiskers, face hair.
<i>in-por</i> ( <i>â-in-por</i> )	lungs.	<i>in-teñ</i>	clitoris.
<i>in-pun</i>	neck.	<i>in-ni</i>	eye-tooth, canine tooth.
<i>in-si</i>	flesh, core, heart.		

2. The Infix *-r-*<sup>2</sup> with Substantives

§ 171. The element *-r-* here is of various origins. In some cases it is probable that the substantive with which it occurs is a direct application of a former verb in which *-r-* expressed the dative objective relation.

This might easily be in such a case as *â-r-nan* subst. link, ring, from an old hypothetical verb (*â-r-nan* to link to, a verb root probably actually surviving in *in-nan* to bind. This class of substantive is probably limited in numbers.

Among pure substantives the infix is quite frequent and occurs in a certain number of instances before synonymous roots here and in Tibetan.

M.	T.	Dim.	K.
<i>â-r-to</i>	vein.	<i>rtsa</i> .	<i>la-sa</i> .
<i>â-r-kleñ</i>	marrow.	<i>rkañ</i> .	
<i>â-r-mê</i>	tail.	<i>rña-ma</i> .	

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps better *in-nom* in the light of T. *agram-pa*. *in-i* perspiration, sweat, is probably really *in-ni* as shown by T. *r-nul* (v. § 160, n. 2, p. 55).

<sup>2</sup> See n. 2, p. 161.

	M.	T.	Dim.	K.
<i>â-r-loñ</i>	rock, stone.	<i>rdo.</i>		
<i>â-r-leñ</i> <sup>1</sup>	man.			( <i>sa-lañ</i> an elder, elderly man.)
<i>â-r-ni</i>	sun, day.			( <i>ša-ni.</i> )
<i>â-r-veñ</i>	feather.			
<i>ke-â-r-joñ</i>	soul.			
	( <i>kâr-joñ.</i> )			
<i>â-r-jo</i>	night.			
<i>â-r-ve</i>	rain.			
<i>â-r-năm</i>	god.			

Many other forms might be added, and it is probable that in some cases we have synonym compounds, though we cannot yet state this with certainty.

In the case of Tibetan *r-ña-ma*, Laufer<sup>2</sup> has suggested an original *\*rañ-ma*, *\*ra-ña-ma*. The latter of these is supported by various forms from the Assam region in which the element in *r* (*ra*) carries no final consonant. Among them we have in the Old Kuki group: Aimol *ra-mai*; in the North Assam group: Miju Mishmi *ra-mai*, Digâru *la-miñ* (fr. *la-mi-ña* ?, a transposition of *\*ra-ña-mi*), Aka *e-rî-m* (certainly for *e-rî-mi*)<sup>3</sup>; while among Bodo forms are: Dîmâ-sâ *ker-mai* and *ber-mai* probably representing triple compounds *\*ke-re-mai*, *\*ka-ra-mai* and *\*be-re-mai*, *\*ba-ra-mai*; with, lastly Tângkhul Nâgâ *â-ka-mei* which seems to support the reconstruction *\*ka-ra-mai* for Dîmâ-sâ.

It is noticeable in this word that where pronominal elements are prefixed, that in *-r-* falls out.<sup>4</sup> In addition to the Tângkhul example above, we have in the Central Nâgâ languages: Âo *te-mi*, Lhôtâ *e-mî*, *e-mie*, and also in Êmpêo *bi-mî*.

Lacking this element are also: Chutiyâ *çi-mi*, Semâ *a-šo-mi*, Daflâ *â-mi*, Abor-Miri *a-me*, *ta-me*,<sup>5</sup> Kachin *niñ-mai*, *n-mai*, and Burmese *a-mrîz*.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps a synonym compound *ra-leñ*. Compare Lepcha *ma-râ man* (= *ma* + *a-râ* ?, *mi* as in Tibetan). In another direction the prefix *-r-* may be related to T. *ro* body, a root, however, which, except in a few instances (such as *ro-rgyab*), designates a dead body.

<sup>2</sup> *The Si-Hia Language*, p. 23, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> See § 181, n. 1, *inf.*

<sup>4</sup> Similarly as against Mikir and Tibetan it is absent in Lhôtâ *e-tô*, Âo *te-za vein*, Lh. *e-nî*, *e-n*, Âo *â-na* sun, Lh. *ô-lân*, *ô-nân* stone, where Lh. *e*, *ô*, and Âo *te-* are pronominal.

<sup>5</sup> Lorrain, *Dictionary of the Abor-Miri Language*, p. 381.

(*â*-)*r-lok* valley, precipice, mountain-side, is perhaps analysable as *ri-log(s)*, from *ri* mountain and *logs* side, two Tibetan roots, while we probably have a compound also in (*â*-)*r-poñ* partition, wall, made up of *ra* enclosure, wall, fence (T. *ra-ba*) and *poñ* (cf. T. *spañ* board, plank).

### 3. *â*- of Series II

§ 172. This element is more widely spread than the older prefix *iñ*-, and occurs both alone and before *-iñ*- as *âñ*-(*â-iñ*-) as in the previous section.

Alone it is found *inter alia* in :—

<i>â-nô-kân</i>	nose.	<i>â-mek</i>	eye.
<i>â-nô</i>	ear.	<i>â-pû</i>	head.
<i>â-ken</i>	foot.	<i>â-rî</i>	hand.
<i>â-so</i>	tooth.	<i>â-dê</i>	tongue.
<i>â-pâk</i>	belly.	<i>â-nun</i>	back.
<i>â-čû</i>	hair.	<i>â-oi</i>	blood.
<i>â-reñ</i>	skin.		

With family relationships it occurs in :—

<i>â-r-leñ</i>	man.	<i>â-r-lô-sô</i>	woman.
<i>â-pî-sô</i>	wife.	<i>â-sô</i>	child.

### ÊMPÊO OR KACHCHÂ NÂGÂ

#### *Preliminary*

§ 173. Though placed in the Nâgâ-Bodo sub-group in the LSI. (iii, 2, p. 379), this classification can hardly be called satisfactory. Especially in regard to its morphological equipment, which lacks nearly all prefixed elements, Êmpêo stands apart from the languages of both the Nâgâ and the Bodo groups.

Thus it does not seem to possess any 3rd personal demonstrative prefix forming adjectival and verbal-noun derivatives, but derives such through the Perfect tense by means of a temporal suffix, while with the substantive the 3rd personal prefix is so rare as to suggest borrowing, the prefix *mi*- man, which it usually employs instead, corresponding directly to Tibetan *mi* man.

Certainly the use of the Perfect tense suffix to form adjectives is paralleled by many other languages in this region, but in none of them is such a usage the typical method, and it is always accompanied by much more numerous prefixed demonstrative forms, making correspondences of the type : Êmpêo *mê-dâ* ripe, Lh. *e-mêc*<sup>1</sup>, Dîm. *gǔ-mun*, *gǔ-min*, M. *ke-men*, far outnumber those of the type : Êmpêo *kâ-dâ* bitter, Lh. *kô-â*, etc. (see below). Êmpêo stands in contradistinction to all these languages in its lack of prefixation.

In the following, which may serve as examples of how the temporal suffix formations of such a language as Lhôtâ (beside its much more frequent use of the prefix *e*-<sup>1</sup>), link Êmpêo with the remaining Bodo and Nâgâ languages, Êmpêo *-dâ* is the Present and Perfect tense suffix, Lhôtâ *-â* the Perfect tense suffix, Dîmâ-sâ *-bâ* and Tibetan *-ba*, *-mo* suffixed indefinite demonstratives, Dîmâ-sâ *ga-*, *gǔ-*, *gǐ-*, and Mikir *ke-*, *kâ-* prefixed demonstratives.

Êmpêo	Lhôtâ	Dîmâ-sâ	Tibetan
<i>kâ-dâ</i> bitter	<i>kô-â</i>	<i>kâ-bâ</i>	<i>kā-ba</i>
<i>lûm-dâ</i> hot, warm	<i>lam-â</i>	<i>duñ-bâ</i>	<i>dro-ba</i>
	<i>e-lam-â</i>		<i>dron-mo</i>
<i>jai-dâ</i> dead	<i>ċi-â</i>	<i>ċi-bâ</i>	<i>aċi-ba</i> , P. <i>ši-ba</i> (death).
	Dîmâ-sâ	Mikir	
	<i>ga-kâ</i>	<i>ke-ho</i>	
	<i>gǔ-duñ</i>	<i>kâ-rom</i>	
	<i>gǐ-ċi</i>	<i>ke-ċi</i>	

The language, in fact, is more archaic than its immediate neighbours, a fact which is frequently evidenced by its vocabulary, which leans at important points towards Tibetan, where adjacent languages have other words.

Thus *mi* man is Tibetan *mî*, *hen-nâm* jungle, wild (*ye-nâm* ?) agrees even better with T. *gñan* wild than does Mikir *in-nâm* wild, jungle, *rehi* (so acc. Soppitt, *Gr.* 43, better perhaps *rêi*) is T. *ri* hill.

The manner in which *mi* man is prefixed to substantives indicating parts of the human body also connects directly with a similar Tibetan usage in *mi-rje* king, sovereign, *mi-ñā* I, etc. (v. § 182 *inf.*).

<sup>1</sup> *e-* of series O. See §§ 104 and 151.

## § 174.    PERSONAL PRONOUNS

Independent	Possessive (= Gen. in <i>-gû</i> , or by position).
-------------	--

## Singular

1st p. <i>â-nûî</i>	<i>â-nûî-gû, â-gû</i> <i>â</i>
2nd p. <i>nân</i>	<i>nân-gû, nâ-gû</i> <i>nân</i>
3rd p. <i>ǰî</i>	<i>ǰî-gû</i> <i>ǰî</i>

## Plural

1st p. <i>â-nûî-mî</i>	<i>â-nûî-mî-gû, â-gû</i> <i>â-nûî-mî, â-nûî</i>
2nd p. <i>nân-nûî-mî</i>	<i>nân-nûî-mî-gû, nân-gû</i>
3rd p. <i>ǰî-mî</i>	<i>ǰî-mî-gû, ǰî-gû</i> <i>ǰî</i>

Among these forms *ǰî* of the 3rd person is probably a demonstrative “that”, perhaps related to Lhôtâ Nâgâ *čî* (v. §§ 147, 148).

## § 175.    DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

Simple root	Singular	Possessive (= Gen. in <i>-gû</i> )	Plural (w. <i>kê-dâ</i> many)
<i>â(?)</i>	<i>ai</i> (= <i>â-i</i> ?) “this”	<i>ai-gû</i>	<i>ai-kê-dâ</i>
<i>û</i>	<i>û-i</i> “that”	<i>ûi-gû</i>	<i>ûi-kê-dâ</i>

## THE VERB

(a) *Elements Standing before the Root*1. *en-* of Series 0

§ 176. With verbs *en-* occurs corresponding to Mikir *in-* in :  
*en-ǰe* to be hungry    M. *in-čir*.

Correspondence to Tibetan *m-* may be traced in *ên-dui* to collect, in which the corresponding Tibetan forms, however, have taken a substantival turn (v. § 26), in *mdun* that portion

of a thing with which one first meets, *mdun-ma* wife, lit. she with whom one is united, *mdud-pa* a knot, lit. a joining.

## 2. The Directive Element *ra-*

§ 177. As a rare survival Êmpêo has *ra-*, representing Tibetan directive *-r-*, as in :—

T.

*ra-kât* to steal, to rob.

*rku-ba*, P. (b)*rkus*, F. *brku*,  
Imp. *rkus* (< \**b-r-kun* as in  
*rkun-ma* thief, theft) (v.  
§ 55).

The final *-t* here is probably a replacement through the ancient perfect in *-d*, met with again in Kachin *la-gut* (also *la-gu*) a thief, Lepcha *kût-mo* a thief, a theft (an old Lepcha root, v. Mainwaring-Grünwedel, *Dic.*, 18).<sup>1</sup>

## (b) Elements Standing after the Root

### 1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 178. Among these the most important are :—

*-dai-* of repetition = “again” (= Gârô *-tai-*, § 131).

Ĵi *tâ-dai-gû* He will do again.

â-nûi *pât-dai-gû* I will come again.

*-tâ-* of complete action (? ; or motion away from ?). Cf.

Bâ. *-tra-*, § 114, Dîm. *-târ-*, § 123.

Ĵi *pâg-tâ-dâ* He ran away.

### 2. The Causative Infix *-pê-*

§ 179. The causative infix following the verb is *-pê* (= vb. tr. to give), which can be employed either with the root or the infinitive in *-rá*.

*náo* to see, *náo-pê* or *náo-râ pê-râ* to cause to see, to show, *náo-râ pê-gû* (Fut.) will show, *náo-râ pê-dâ* (Perf.) shown, the root *pê* thus still exerting its independence. Cf. Bârâ usage, § 115.

<sup>1</sup> Lepcha evidence, however, goes to show that *-t* here is a phonetic change from Tibetan *-s*. It occurs again in Lepcha *zót* food, T. *zas* (Perf. of *za-ba* to eat) ; L. *a-hrât* bone, T. *rus-pa* ; L. *tûk-pât* knee (Kachin *la-pût*), T. *pus-mo* ; L. *krut* counsel, advice, T. *gros*, and others.

## THE SUBSTANTIVE

*Elements Standing before the Root*1. *en-, hen-*

§ 180. With a few substantives this prefix occurs, and is evidently the same element as Mikir *in-*, as in the following :—

Êmpêo <i>en-ŋai</i> salt.	M. <i>in-ti</i> .
<i>hen-nâm</i> jungle.	<i>in-nâm</i> .

In one of these instances the prefix appears to correspond to Tibetan *g-* (cf. Mikir, § 160 *in extr.*), *i.e.* :—

Êmpêo <i>hen-nâm</i> wild.	T. <i>gñan</i> .
----------------------------	------------------

This Êmpêo form is thus possibly *ye-nâm* as already suggested above in § 173.

2. *ba-, bá-* of Series II

§ 181. As a link prefix of the 3rd person we find, *ba-, bá-* of Series II surviving in some few instances.

In Soppitt's *Outline Grammar*, for instance, we find :  
*ŋi ba-gî* his house (p. 26) ; *ba-sui* his heart (ex. : *ba-sui-lai-ŋai* . . . his heart (*i.e.* feelings) being thus) (p. 35).

Other cases in which it adheres are :—

<i>ba-le</i> tongue.	<i>ba-ŋon</i> throat.
<i>bá-nêô</i> nose.	<i>ba-ko-n</i> <sup>1</sup> ear.
<i>bi-mî</i> tail.	

3. *mi-* ("man") as a prefix

§ 182. Otherwise, in place of a pronominal element belonging to Series II, Êmpêo compounds its substantives

<sup>1</sup> Compare, however, Aka (Darrang) *pu* ear. *-n* evidently represents the root here in Êmpêo, as in T. (*r-)**na*, the whole form being comparable to McCulloch's Kwoireng or Liyang *pá-kon* (= ? *pá-ko-n*) (v. LSI., iii, 2, p. 482), in which, however, we do not know the nature of *pá-*. That Êmpêo *ba-ko-n* is to be so divided is indicated by e.g. Chulikâtâ Mishmi *a-ku-ná*, Tângkhul Nâgâ *ku-ná*, Khangoi *ku-ná*, Maring *ka-ná-bil*, and others. Êmpêo here shows one of the most marked characteristics of the North Assam Group as exemplified in, e.g. Daflâ *ká-n* dark, T. *nag(-pa)* ; *á-n* mother, T. *ma* ; *á-ě* elder brother, T. *ŋo-bo* (col. 'a-ŋo) ; *á-l* good, T. *legs-pa*, and others, in which every trace of the root as preserved in Tibetan, except the initial, has disappeared.



indicating parts of the human body with *mi* "man" <sup>1</sup> prefixed.

These forms are directly comparable to such Tibetan compounds as *mi-rje* king, *mi-na* I, *mi-bdag* I myself, for the more usual *rje*, *na*, *bdag*.

Êmpêo has the following :—

<i>mi-sîn</i> back.	<i>mi-gu</i> belly.
<i>mi-pûm</i> body.	<i>mi-lûn</i> chest.
<i>mi-mik</i> eye.	<i>mi-mûi</i> face.
<i>mi-pêi</i> head.	<i>mi-mui</i> mouth.
<i>mi-pâ</i> arm, hand.	<i>mi-pi</i> leg, foot.

## II. THE KUKI-CHIN LANGUAGES <sup>2</sup>

### *Preliminary*

#### A

§ 183. The pronominal material of the Kuki-Chin group is practically uniform, consisting of a 1st personal root *kê*, *kei*, a 2nd person *nañ*, *nañ-ma*, *na*, and a 3rd person *a-ma*, *â-ma*, *â-ni*, of which the abbreviated prefix forms are : *ka-*, *na-*, and *a-*, which show the same uniformity.

Among the demonstrative pronouns, the same contrast in vowel colouring between those of proximity and distance is in evidence throughout these languages as we have already noticed in the languages of the Assam area (v. § 102).

Thus we have in Northern Chin : Thâdo *hi* this, but *hû*, *čû*, that ; Râltê *hi* this, but *ču* that ; Paite *hi* this, but *hu*, *ku*, *ha*, *ka* that.

In Central Chin : Zahao *hi* this, but *čû*, *ka* that ; Lai *hi* this, but *čû* that ; Lushei *hei*, *he* this, but *ču* *ku*, *kâ*, *sâ* that ; Banjôgî *hi* this, but *ču* that ; Pânkhû *hi*, *nê* this, but *čû*, *ho*, *kâ*, *mâ* that.

<sup>1</sup> The writer believes the equation of this prefix with Meithei pronominal *ma-* suggested tentatively by Sten Konow (ZDMG., 56 (1902), p. 514), to be mistaken. It is actually found as *mi* man in Meithei ; also in Lushei, where it is used as a prefix, as in Êmpêo and Tibetan, in *mi-dât* a liar, *mi-bum* a knave, *mi-ruk* a thief, and others.

<sup>2</sup> These languages are here dealt with but briefly, owing to our very imperfect knowledge of the majority of them as yet. To make their characteristics as clear as possible, they have further been dealt with in groups, instead of as single languages, the dialects showing such close relationship that this method may be well applied.

In Southern Chin: Khami *hî* this (or, here), but *hû*, *hó* that (deducible from *hin-nû* this (prob. for *hi-ni*, v. LSI., iii, 3, p. 352), *hî-nái* id. (in Arakan), *hi(-in-na)* here(-from), and *hû-ni* that, *hó-nái* id. (in Arakan)).

§ 184. Amongst the pronominal prefixes, *ka-*, *ká-*, *ga-* in a 3rd personal sense, which occurs in some of these languages, is important as forming a link with the Nâgâ group,<sup>1</sup> from which source, indeed, it may originally have crept in here.

In this connection it may be recalled that the Kuki-Chin languages belong in the western division of the languages of Burma, the separation of which from their more easterly neighbours (excluding Kachin) may have taken place early, and in the north, occasioning continued contact between them and Nâgâ tribes even further to the west.<sup>2</sup>

At any rate, *ka-*, *ga-* as a 3rd personal element is strictly alien to Kuki-Chin, where it is the 1st person of which this root is typical.

In certain of the link languages leading over from the Nâgâ Group to the Kuki-Chin languages, the use of this element with the finite verb is still in evidence, preserving in this way a usage once possessed by the former, but now lost.

Thus, for instance, in the Old Kuki sub-group, which in important respects forms a connecting link between the Nâgâ languages and the Central Chin group, we find among others in the LSI., iii, 3: Anâl *ka-tê-wal* (to his father) he said (278, 279); *ka-pê-mâ-nû* they gave (him) not (278); *kêl a-ê-râ kê-râ ka-pê-mâ* even a young goat there (or, it) has not been given (279, 275); *lú-lâm ka-tâ-ye* the taking of a head it is good (280); while in Hirôi-Lamgâng we have, from the same source, among others: *a-pá á-raû* . . . *ka-têm-pi* his father divided the goods (288); *ka-mân-tok ka-do-fan-ják* because he was lost and he has been found again (289); *ka-di-ka-rr-hê-la* . . . *ka-kin-jê-rr-pa-dá* (my son) from his being dead . . . since he has become alive (289); *ka-a-má* they are living (288); *ka-am* he is (285); *ka-ra-wá* he comes (285); *ka-čúm* it is proper (285); *ma-má ka-wá* he went (285); and others.

In view of the probability of the original connection between

<sup>1</sup> Cf. LSI., iii, 3, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lewis, *The Tribes of Burma* (Ethnographical Survey of India; Burma, No. 4), pp. 6-7.

this element and Tibetan *ko*,<sup>1</sup> it is interesting to find a form in Sopvoma of the Naga-Kuki group approaching it in vocalization, viz. *ko-*. In the LSI., iii, 2, we find the following constructions with this element : *u-pû-nâ u-nâ . . . ko-ĵû-pi-ê* his father his wealth . . . (between his two sons) (he (*ko-*)) divided (459) ; *ha-na (i-niû-lê ti ma ka-li-no bū-â) ko-a-zil-ê* He (to a man residing in that country) (he (*ko-*)) went and joined himself (459).

§ 185. The precise origin and older connections of the first element *a-* in the pronoun of the 3rd person are not yet entirely clear. There is small doubt, however, that it was originally a demonstrative pronoun,<sup>2</sup> like the second element *-ma*.

In consonance with this origin, *a-* now functions clearly as a 3rd personal pronoun throughout the Kuki-Chin group.

This, for us, is a very important point, and is the immediate reason why *a-* now appears so frequently within these languages as a permanently adhering prefix with adjectives, substantives indicating parts of the human body and family relationships, with concepts, that is, which are apt to occur, at least in thought, linked to a genitive possessor. *a-* is, in short, a link prefix, and as such stands on exactly the same footing as similar prefixes elsewhere. Many of these we have already traced in the Bodo and Naga groups, among the forms of which it is likely that the prefix of Series II in the Naga-Kuki group, and *â-* in Mikir,<sup>3</sup> Khoirao, Rengma, Semâ, and possibly some others<sup>4</sup> of these languages is a closely related, or even actually the same element.

The writer, however, would not attempt to say how far the affinity may extend, for in this region we come upon what is probably a quite distinct element, outwardly of the same

<sup>1</sup> v. §§ 96, 107.

<sup>2</sup> v. Sten Konow, ZDMG., Bd. 56 (1902), p. 503.

<sup>3</sup> See Lyall, *The Mikirs*, p. 161. The 3rd personal pronoun form *â-lâ* of Mikir, formed with this element *â-*, is a double form comparable to Kuki-Chin *a-ma* in its manner of formation. Lyall (*op. cit.*, p. 79) believes *â* here to represent the original true 3rd personal pronoun. In the writer's opinion, however, it is more likely to be the demonstrative of distance "that", which we should expect to find standing opposite *î, ê*, of proximity "this", which, as we have seen above (§ 101), is probably found now as a 1st person plural pronominal form (really "these"). It is probable that Kuki-Chin *a-, â-*, goes back to a demonstrative of distance "that". The relationship in that case existing with Lhôtâ *ô-* (v. § 104) is of especial significance in view of the Lhôtâ personal and demonstrative form *ô-mô* (v. §§ 147, 148).

<sup>4</sup> See the Table in § 104.

form, which should rather be connected with the Tibetan usage of 'a- with family relationships and other substantives,<sup>1</sup> and cannot possibly be of pronominal origin.

So in the case of Gârô, where â- is rare, but occurs sometimes with substantives of family relationships, the affinity is probably with this non-pronominal usage. As far south at least as this in the Assam area, this formation appears to have penetrated, but it will take much research yet to definitely disentangle the two elements in all cases.<sup>2</sup>

In view of Laufer's valuable contribution on *The prefix a- in the Indo-Chinese Languages*,<sup>3</sup> the writer would briefly sketch his own views on this subject, which, with reluctance, he finds at variance with that authority's opinions.

Tentatively, at least, the writer would divide the prefix a- in the Tibeto-Burman languages into two: a northern non-pronominal, and a southern pronominal usage, to the first assigning Tibetan (and Chinese)<sup>4</sup> with a number of Tibeto-Burman dialects fringing their area on the south. Most of the Tibeto-Burman dialects of Yün-nan and Szĕ-ch'uan probably belong here, though there is nothing in the way a- is there used (including its employment with colour adjectives) which would preclude its being pronominal.<sup>5</sup> Belonging with these, and extending down to the south like a tongue we have Kachin and Burmese.

In the second group fall, with a few exceptions like Gârô, all the Tibeto-Burman languages south of the territory occupied by the first, and embracing all the dialects of Assam and Western Burma.

If we do not make at least this division we are hard pushed to find any single impulse which could have given rise to the differing usages of the prefix, or to find any single formula to embrace all the resulting cases. Vial's "appellatif" idea

<sup>1</sup> Laufer has collected these under categories in the JRAS., 1915, pp. 761-4.

<sup>2</sup> The result may be illustrated by the term for "elder brother": (a) Non-pronominal prefix: Koñ-po Tibetan 'a-ta, Kanāwari a-te, Gârô â-dā ("brother"), Kôch (of Dacca) â-dā (LSI., iii, 2, p. 142); (b) Pronominal, prefix: Lhôtā Nāgā ô-tā (Dimā-sā bu-dā), Sho a-tā. Or, again, by that for "father": (a) Tibetan (col.) 'a-pā, Dafā â-bo, â-b, Gârô â-pā, Bur. a-pā, a-pĕ; (b) Lh. N. ô-pô, Mikir â-pô (Meithei ma-pā), Lai a-pa Banjôgī â-pā Shō a-pô. See also § 103.

<sup>3</sup> JRAS., 1915, pp. 757-80.

<sup>4</sup> v. Laufer, *op. cit.*, pp. 757-60.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Laufer's contrary view, *op. cit.*, p. 775, and see again below.

will never do it, though it may appear reasonable enough for Gni Lo-lo,<sup>1</sup> at least in family relationship terms.

§ 186. By making this division, and thus separating the usage of *a-* typical of the Kuki-Chin area from that of *a-* in Burmese, we find a definite explanation for the almost universal substantival nature of the de-verbal *a-* derivatives in Burmese as against the more numerous adjectival meanings typical of the Kuki-Chin languages, particularly in the north.

The point of chief import here is that Burmese in exhibiting such a marked substantival usage of *a-*, directly continues the practice started by Tibetan with non-pronominal '*a-*', while the Kuki-Chin group, particularly in its more northerly members, reflects in its much more numerous adjectival derivatives in *a-* the principle peculiar to 3rd personal pronominal prefix forms as exemplified in the Assam area.

We thus have clearly before us the explanation of these two intermingling but quite unrelated turns taken by derivatives from verbs in what is outwardly but one prefix. For we have here actually a confusion of two distinct prefixes<sup>2</sup> closely similar in sound, in the first of which the typical derivative is subjective in sense (a substantive), and is not in any way felt to be a possession with a pronominal link prefix, while the second, whether the derivative is actually objective (an adjective), or a basic substantive, is exactly this very thing.

The Bodo and Nâgâ groups show us this last clearly enough. "Good" is "his being good", "green" "its being green", just as "hand" is "his hand" or "foot" "his foot". The tendency to attach intangible ideas to tangible personal possessors, and to link the part with its whole, is the natural result of a lack of abstract thought among the speakers of these languages.

The line of demarcation between Kuki-Chin and Burmese in the matter of these two usages is not clearly drawn, for whether by confusion, or whether due to the yet undiscovered

<sup>1</sup> Paul Vial, *Dictionnaire Français-Lolo, dialecte Gni* (Hong-Kong, 1909), 21. For Laufer's view on this point see his article already quoted, pp. 777-8. The special selection of reduplicated forms without the prefix, when special appeal is intended is important against this view. So, for instance in the Kesarsage, *Wintermythus* (ed. Francke), i, 17: '*A-ne bkur dman-mo* is directly besought as *ne-ne*: *bka-drin-can-ni ne-ne<o-na dños-de-la gsan-dañ* "Oh gracious *ne-ne* (lit. aunt) listen now (I pray thee)." Francke (*op. id.*, p. 64) has correctly noted this form *ne-ne* as that for "liebvolle Anrede".

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Sten Konow, ZDMG., 56 (1902), pp. 492-3; 513-14; cf. also p. 495, for the Nâgâ languages. See further the same writer's views in the LSI., iii, 3. pp. 5, 15, 17-18.

presence of a non-pronominal *a-* in the south of the Kuki-Chin area, there is a gradual shading off from the objective forms in the north of this region where they are greatly in the majority, to a distinct preponderance of subjective forms in the south, which finds its ultimate fulfilment in Burmese where they are all but constant.

The same root can sometimes be traced, and the following will exemplify the contrast: Thâdo (N. Chin) *a-min* adj. ripe, Lushei (Central Chin) *a-mîn* id., but Burmese *a-maṅ* subst. ripeness: Thâdo *a-kôn* adj. bent, crooked, Lushei *a-koi* id., but Burmese *a-kuiṇ* subst. a large branch of a tree (fr. *kuiṇ* to be bent, to droop); Thâdo *a-sá*, *a-śá* adj. thick, but Shō (Southern Chin) *a-s'o* subst. thickness.<sup>1</sup>

§ 187. The second element *-ma* of the typical Kuki-Chin pronoun of the 3rd person, which is undoubtedly demonstrative in origin,<sup>2</sup> is still found functioning alone in Meithei.

In that language, in addition to its conscious use as a possessive prefix forming such genitives as *ma-pá* his father, *ma-náo* his son, *ma-čá* his child, *ma-puk* his belly,<sup>3</sup> it adheres as a permanent accretion to family relationship terms,<sup>4</sup> just as does the element *a-* in the typical Kuki-Chin form.

Thus we have Meithei:—

<i>ma-pá</i> father.	<i>ma-má</i> mother.
<i>ma-yá-má</i> elder brother.	<i>ma-náo</i> younger brother.
<i>ma-čem</i> elder sister.	<i>ma-čal</i> younger sister.
<i>ma-čá</i> child.	

In the link languages of the Nâgâ-Kuki sub-group, it is used with the finite verb, as in the following passages from the Linguistic Survey of India, iii, 2:—

### Sopvomâ

- (1) *u-(n)ná no-nau-ná . . . u-ná i-nû-i-sa mo-ho-ê.*

His younger son . . . (he (*mo-*)) wasted all his wealth (p. 459).

- (2) *ha-na . . . ma-mi-yê* He (*ha-na*, *ma-*) became wretched (p. 459).

<sup>1</sup> v. § 211 *inf.*

<sup>2</sup> v. Sten Konow, ZDMG., 56 (1902), p. 503.

<sup>3</sup> v. LSI., iii, 3, pp. 33-9.

<sup>4</sup> v. LSI., iii, 3, pp. 46-7.

- (3) *mai ċi-ná . . . ha-na ma-tá-a*

That man . . . (he (*ma-*)) sent him (p. 459).

- (4) *a-pû-ná . . . ma-ki* His father . . . (he (*ma-*)) kissed (him)  
(p. 459).

### Maring

- (1) *â-pâ-ni . . . ma-lûn-si-bai . . . ma-ċûp-lâ.*

His father . . . (his (*ma-*)) feeling compassion . . . (he  
(*ma-*)) kissed him (p. 477).

- (2) *â-ċâ û-pâ-ni ma-tûn-kâ-bai.*

His elder son upon his (*ma-*) getting angry (p. 478).

§ 188. The following table gives the successive pronominal prefix usages traceable in the Kuki-Chin languages so far as affecting the 3rd person.

The entries are thus limited to 3rd personal forms (the 1st and 2nd personal prefixes of Series II having been omitted) in order not to confuse the issue, and to render clearer comparison between this and the similar table for the Bodo and Nâgâ languages of the Assam area (§ 104), where 3rd personal forms only are the outstanding feature.

It must further be borne in mind that much laxity is in evidence in the employment of many of these Kuki-Chin prefixes, *ka-*, *kâ-*, *ke-*, for instance, of the 3rd person in Series I, being frequently found in 1st personal senses, due obviously to a mingling of Kuki-Chin and Nâgâ pronominal usages.

Series III				Series II				Series I				Series 0			
Independent				Subst.		Verb		Subst.		Verb		Subst.		Verb	
1	2	3		1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Meithei . . . ai	nañ	ma													
Thádo . . . kei-má	nañ-má	a-má		a-		a-		ka- ká-		ka- ga-					
Siyin . . . ké-má	nañ-má	a-má		a-		a-									
Lai . . . ké-má	nañ-má	a(n)-má		a-		a-								in-*	
Lakher . . . kei-ma	na-ma	a-nan		a- pa-		a- pa-									
Lushei . . . kei-má	nañ-má	a-má				a-								in-*	
Banjógi . . . kéi-má	nañ-má	á-má á-ni		á-		á-		ká- ké-		ká-					
Hrángkhol . . . gé-má	nan-má	á-má		á-		á-		gá- ká-						en- in-*	
Hallám . . . kei-má	nan-má	á-má		á-		á-		ká-		ká-				in-*	
Langrong . . . kai-má	nan-má	á-ni		á-		á-		ká-?						in-*	
Aimol . . . kai	nañ	a-ma		a-		a- ma-?									

N. Chin

Central Chin

Old Kuki



Old Kuki

Chiru	.	kai	nañ	a-ma	a- ma-	a- ma-	ka- kũ-	ka- kũ-		
Kolhreng	.	kai	nañ	a-má	a-	a-	ka- ki- kẽ-	ka- ki- kẽ-		
Kóm	.	kai	nañ	a-ma	a-	a-(ka-) (ma, man-?)	ka-	ka- kõ-	in.*	
Pürüm	.	kai	nañ	a-mo mo	a- ma-	a-				
Anál	.	ni	nan	a-ma	a- ma-	a- ma- pa- pá, b-	ka-	ka-		
Hirói-Lamgáng	.	nai	nan	ma-ma	a- ma-	a- ma- pa-, po-	ka-	ka-		
Shö	.	kyé	naun	a-yá pó	a- á-; (ma-)	a- ma-, m-				
Khami	.	kái	nán	há-ni	a- á-	á-	ka-			
Burmese	.	ná	sañ nañ man:	sá						

Southern  
Chin

## B

§ 189. The directive infixes with verbs are themselves nearly all traceable in this region to old verb roots<sup>1</sup> which have in some cases disappeared from independent use, and remain only in these infixed forms. They are thus replacement elements, and together with the new prefixed subject particles, perpetuate in principle the old expanded verb forms<sup>2</sup> which in the Assam area, though actually employing some of the older original elements,<sup>3</sup> are not so frequently preserved.

Frequently the infix is sufficiently strong to bear the whole directive force alone, the object standing unmarked as to case.

Thus, e.g., Siyin: *a-mâ-nâ kô-mâ tâû-loñ hóm-piê(t)-hi* He gave us the gun, though the original construction is better represented when the infix repeats a preceding case suffix, as e.g. *a-mâ kê-mâ-hun hôn-kâ-hi* He shot at me.

§ 190. The fully expanded verb form of Kuki-Chin is exemplified in the following examples:—

(1) Subj. Prefix + Direct. Inf. + Root + Descript. Infix + Tense Suffix.

Lai: *ka-vûn-čim-dwok-lai* I will go and tell him quickly.

(2) Subj. Prefix + Obj. Inf. (Pronom.) + Root + Descript. Inf. + Tense Suffix.

Lai: *na-ka-čîn-fon-lo* Neither didst thou give me (lit. Thou gavest me also not (-*lo*)).

With their full and flexible morphological equipment these languages often express with great clearness, fine shades of thought.

This may be exemplified by the following passage from Lai (v. LSI., iii, 3, p. 125).

*kan-in-lâm-na kan-in-boi-na a-ta-kô-da-kô* "I declare (-*na*) that for us (*kan-*) to rejoice (*lâm*) amongst ourselves (-*in-*), I declare (-*na*) that for us (*kan-*) to feast (*boi*) with one another (-*in-*), it (*a-*) is surely (-*kô-*) fitting (-*ta-*) is it not (-*da-*, interrog. v. LSI., iii, 3, pp. 121-2), indeed (-*kô*)."

<sup>1</sup> A notable exception is the Old Kuki group. These dialects have already furnished us with considerable material in this regard (v. § 165), and show characteristics differing sufficiently from the Kuki-Chin languages in general to warrant their exclusion here.

<sup>2</sup> See §§ 1, 6.

<sup>3</sup> See especially Mikir directive -*r-* (found also in Old Kuki) in § 164.

## A. NORTHERN CHIN

### THE VERB

#### (a) *Elements Standing before the Root*

##### 1. *ka-* of Series I

§ 191. With a 3rd personal sense this is infrequent. The following are illustrative of its occurrence with verbs in this group :—

With participles and the finite verb in the LSI., iii, 3 (pp. 67–70 and 104) :—

Thâdo *ka-čê-lé* He, having gone.

*ka-ti-lé* He, saying.

*ka-yân* He, hearing.

*ka-čîn-ê* He is grazing (cattle).

In some cases the prefix is a permanent accretion not limited to the 3rd person.

Of this nature, Hodson <sup>1</sup> gives the following forms in *ga-* :—

*ka-ga-del-û-ve* We are in the habit of pursuing.

*ga-ki-lâ-en* Take.

##### 2. *a-* of Series II

§ 192. Of the pronominal prefixes of Series II employed with the finite verb in this group, i.e. *ka-* for the 1st person, *na-* for the 2nd person, and *a-* for the 3rd person, the last is retained by adjectival derivatives.

Thâdo will illustrate :—

<i>a-pâ</i>	good.	<i>a-sân</i>	high.
<i>a-nem</i> }	low.	<i>a-fou</i>	fat.
<i>a-čôm</i> }		<i>a-pâ</i>	thin.
<i>a-lûm</i>	hot (of water).	<i>a-šô</i>	hot.
<i>a-nen</i>	dirty.	<i>a-ten</i> }	clean.
<i>a-len</i>	large.	<i>a-nou</i> }	
<i>a-nê</i> }	small.		
<i>a-lô-in</i> }			

##### 3. Traces of Directive Infixes of the Old Order

§ 193. In Siyin certain instances of aspiration of the initials of transitive verbs, comparable to Burmese practice, occur, which obviously have the same significance for the

<sup>1</sup> *Thado Grammar*, pp. 3 and 27.

existence of former directive elements of the old order, that they have there.<sup>1</sup>

Instances in Siyin are :—

*kîem* to decrease, to make less, as against *kîem* to grow less, to abate.

*kên* to separate, to disperse, as against *ken* to go away, to leave, to abandon.

*kâm* to collect, to bring together, as against *kâm* to come together, to assemble.

#### 4. Directive Infixes

§ 194. Among directive infixes preceding the verb root, are

(1) Motion towards the object, frequently the speaker.

Thâdo *hin-*, *han-*, Siyin *hôm-*, *hauñ-*, *hôn-*, Râlte *ha-*, *han-*  
Paite *hoñ-*, *on-*.

This probably represents one or more prepositions “ here, hither ”, still found in Siyin *hôm*, *hôn* ; also *hôn* towards, at. Relationship may, on the other hand, exist with Tibetan *-on-ba* to come, to approach.

Thâdo *hin-čô*, Siyin *hôm-pai-pui* to bring (fr. Th. *čô* to move, Siyin *pai-pui* vb. caus. to send).

(2) Motion downwards.

Râlte *zu-* “ down ”. An old verb root. (See Central Chin, § 203, Âo § 142 (s.v. *-zak*)).

(3) Motion away, from some given point, generally on level ground.

Paite *va-*.

This is probably an old verb root “ to go ” (v. again Central Chin, § 203).

#### 5. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 195. With adverbial, non-directive, force, we have :—

(1) Mutuality.

Thâdo *ki-*, *gi-*, Siyin *ki-*.

Thâdo *ki-tô*, Siyin *ki-ši*, *ka-ši* to meet ; Thâdo *ki-nă*, Siyin *ki-hô* to quarrel.

(2) Repetition.

Siyin *čî-*.

This element is found again in *-čî°* as a descriptive infix after the root (v. § 197, with which cf. Âo *-ši* (§ 141 *sup.*)).

<sup>1</sup> v. § 218 *inf.*

## 6. The Causative Infix

§ 196. The causative infix is: Thâdo -sû-, -šû- (cf. šă to make, § 198 *inf.*).

### (b) Elements Standing after the Root

#### 1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 197. Among these infixes after the root, are:—

(1) Completive. “Entirely.”

Râltê, Paite -vek-, as in Râltê *a-kâm-vek-a* He collecting all (his property) (79).<sup>1</sup>

(2) Superlative. “Very, exceedingly.”

Râltê, Paite -em-em-, as in Râltê *a-nuam-em-em-a* He wished exceedingly (79).

(3) Repetitive. “Again.”

(a) Râltê -leh-, as in *ka-mu-leh-ka-u* (Him) we saw again (80).  
Cf. T- *slar* again, before the verb, B. *lô* to repeat.

(b) Siyin -či°- as in *a-mâ-min na-sun-či°-ô* Tell him again.  
(See § 195, No. 2 *sup.*)

(c) Thâdo -kit-,<sup>2</sup> as in e.g. *ka-čc-kit-din-ka-hi* I must return.  
Sometimes this has a continuative force “again and again”, as in *bê-kit* to beat (a drum) continuously (fr. *bê* to beat).

Siyin -kik-,<sup>2</sup> as in: *a-kî-ken-kik-hî* They went forth (*i.e.* dispersed) again.

(4) Continuative. “Continuously, again and again.”

(a) Paite -tek-, as in: *na-om-tek-a* You live always (with me) (86).

(b) Râltê -reñ-, as in: *na-om-reñ-ho-va* You live (with me) always (80).

(5) Accompaniment. “With.”

Siyin -kom-.

#### 2. Causative Infixes

§ 198. The causative infix is:—

(a) Thâdo -pê-, -pi- (= vb. to give), Siyin -pui- (cf. *pê* to give).

(b) Thâdo -šă-, Siyin -sâ- -sâk- (= vb. to make), Paite -šak-.  
(Cf. ? Burmese -čê- (causative infix, fr. *čê* to send, to order. See, however, next entry (c).)

<sup>1</sup> References here are to the LSI., iii, 3.

<sup>2</sup> The same variation in the final is also found in Thâdo *a-tă, a-tat new, Siyin ták.* See also § 56.

(c) Râltê -tik-.

This is probably cognate to Tibetan *aṣug-pa* (P. *bṣug*, F. *gžug*, Imp. *čug*) to cause, to compel, as noticed above in § 96 (*q.v.*), where the *i : u* vowel relationship was noticed.

## THE SUBSTANTIVE

### *Elements Standing before the Root*

#### 1. *ka-, kâ-, ke-* of Series I

§ 199. The oldest pronominal prefix traceable with substantives in this group is *ka-, kâ-, ke-*, found in the Thâdo (Nâgâ Hills) and Khongzai (Manipur) dialects recorded in the Linguistic Survey of India.

The forms with this prefix there given are :—

Thâdo	Khongzai	
	<i>ka-kot.</i>	hand
<i>ka-kîn.</i>	<i>ka-kên.</i>	foot
	<i>ka-nâ(k-).</i>	nose
<i>kâ-mit</i>	<i>ka-mit.</i>	eye
<i>ka-kâm-mu.</i>	<i>ka-kam.</i>	mouth
	<i>ka-hâ.</i>	tooth
<i>ka-bil-kol.</i>	<i>ka-bil.</i>	ear
	<i>ka-sam.</i>	hair
	<i>ka-lû-čan.</i>	head
	<i>ka-lei.</i>	tongue
	<i>ka-woi.</i>	belly
	<i>ka-tûn-tûn.</i>	back
	<i>ka-pâ.</i>	father
	<i>ka-nû.</i>	mother
<i>ke-û-pâ</i>		brother (elder).
<i>ke-nâu-pâ</i>	<i>ka-nâû.</i>	brother (younger).
<i>ke-û-nu</i>		sister (elder).
<i>ke-nâu-nu</i>	<i>ka-nâû.</i>	sister (younger).

#### 2. *a-* of Series II

§ 200. The newer pronominal prefixes used with the substantive are the same as those with the verb, *i.e.* 1st p. *ka-*, 2nd p. *na-*, 3rd p. *a-*.

The substantive is regularly provided with these, and does not yet, except in certain instances, tend to retain permanently the prefix of the 3rd person.

Cases in which this tendency is in evidence, however, are :—

Thâdo	Siyin	
<i>a-nôn, nôn.</i>		neck, throat
	<i>a-mai, mai.</i>	face
	<i>a-sam, sam.</i>	hair
	<i>a-wun.</i>	skin

In its retention of the 3rd personal prefix *a-* as a detachable element, and its keeping it still definitely among the pronouns, these languages (together with Central Chin) stand in contrast to Southern Chin. (v. § 214.)

## B. CENTRAL CHIN

### THE VERB

#### (a) *Elements Standing before the Root*

##### 1. *kâ-* of Series I

§ 201. This is rare with verbs in a 3rd personal sense. The following are from the LSI., iii, 3, p. 148.

With the finite verb : Banjôgî *kâ-sim* he said ; *kâ-lai* he heard.

##### 2. *a-* of Series II

§ 202. Of the pronominal prefixes of Series II used with the finite verb in this group, viz. *ka-* for the 1st person, *na-* for the 2nd person, and *a-* for the 3rd person, the last is retained by adjectival derivatives, as, for instance, in the following from Lushei and Lai.

Lushei	Lai	
<i>a-šân</i>	<i>a-san</i>	high.
<i>a-lao</i>	<i>a-dâ-ko, a-kîm</i>	fat.
<i>a-lûm, a-šâ</i>	<i>a-lîn</i>	hot.
<i>a-rôl</i>	<i>a(n)-nân</i>	large.
<i>a-têi</i>	<i>a(m)-mê</i>	small.
<i>a-tâ</i>	<i>a-tâ</i>	good.
<i>a-nem</i>	<i>a-nem</i>	soft.
<i>a-rît</i>	<i>a-rît</i>	heavy.
<i>a-šei</i>	<i>a-šâ</i>	long.

##### 3. Directive Infixes

§ 203. Among directive infixes before the root, are :—

(1) Motion towards an indirect object, frequently towards the speaker.

- (a) Zahao *hon-*, Banjôgî *hôn-*, Lushei *hân-*, Pânkhû *hoñ-*. Perhaps related to the root *-on-ba* to come, to approach, in Tibetan. A sense of direction upwards seems sometimes to occur here.

Lushei *hân-lâ* to bring (fr. *lâ* to take); *in-á* . . . *hân-kál* to go (*kál*) towards (*hân-*) the house.

- (b) Lai *hê-*. Probably an old preposition still extant in Lai with the sense of "to, towards".
- (c) Lushei *lô-*; *ron-*, *ran-*.

Lushei *lô-kál* to go towards, to approach, whence also: to come, to arrive (fr. *kál* to go).

(2) Motion towards.

Zahao, Lai *rak-*. With verbs of motion this seems in some cases to imply contact or arrival at a given point. Thus we have in Zahao: *a-rak-mû-i* he, coming (*rak?*) in sight (of his father) (LSI., iii, 3, p. 113), and *a-rak-hâl-i* he, coming (*rak?*) asked (*loc. id.*), and in Lai (*op. cit.*, p. 121): *rak-pu* to bring, *rak-kal-lo* Go! (Imp.), *rak-ëim-lo* Tell (him) (Imp.). Perhaps this root is comparable to Burmese *rāk* to arrive, to reach, although this meaning is not always clear in *rak*. Compare with the passages above: Zahao *rak-bun-tir-o-la* you, putting on (his feet) (LSI., iii, 3, p. 114) and *na-rak-tah-šak-vei-i* thou caused also to kill (*loc. id.*).

(3) Motion downwards.

Lushei *zuk-*, *zu-*. This is an old verb root *zuk* to go down, to descend, the Burmese *sak*, and is evidently the same element as *Âo -zak* in § 142.

(4) Motion, generally on level ground.

Zahao *va-*, Lai *v<sup>a</sup>-*, *va-*, *vân-*, Banjôgî *va-*, Lushei *vâ-*. Probably an old verb root "to go". Compare such a construction as Lai *kê-mâ lâ va-kól-lo* Go (*va-*) and search for my mules. It is evidently the same root as Lhôtâ, *wô*, *wá*, *Âo á-o* to go (*v.* § 139 in *extr.*).

#### 4. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 204. As an element of this nature preceding the root, Lai and Lushei *in-* may express (a) mutuality, or (b) a reflexive sense.



As an infix of (a) mutuality, it has come to be a permanent prefix in Lushei :—

<i>in-búan</i> to wrestle.	<i>in-lom-lem</i> to play together.
<i>in-el</i> to disagree.	<i>in-tsúal</i> to quarrel.
<i>in-tă</i> to visit.	<i>in-tên</i> to separate.

While in Lai, are :—

*in-lăm* to make merry with one another.  
*in-nam* to kiss each other.  
*in-ê* to eat with one another.  
 etc.

As an infix representing (b) reflexive senses, as in Lushei *ka-in-vel* I beat myself, as against *ka-vel* I beat (another), it has become a permanent prefix in, for instance, Lushei :—

*in-búal* to bathe oneself.  
*in-tsiem* to prepare, to be ready.

and in Lai *in-rwa* to say to oneself.

The two senses are closely interwoven and are often difficult to disentangle, as is shown in the Lai sentence : *kan-ni kan-in-ê-lân kan-in-lăm-lân kan-in-boi-lân* We, let us eat (lit. feed ourselves, or, eat with one another), let us be merry (amongst ourselves), let us feast (with one another). (LSI., iii, 3, p. 124.)

As a particle of mutuality, *in-* naturally corresponds to *Thâdo* and *Siyin ki*<sup>-1</sup> as in :—

Lushei *in-búan*. *Thâdo ki-bôn* to wrestle.

Lushei *in-tă*. *Thâdo ki-fô*. *Siyin ki-ši* to meet.

### (a) *Elements Standing after the Root*

#### 1. Descriptive Abverbial Infixes

§ 205. Among these after the root, are :—

(1) With completive force. “ Entirely, all.”

Lushei *-vek-*, *-vêk-*, as in *a-kâm-vek-a* He collected all (his property) (135).<sup>2</sup>

(2) With superlative force. “ Very, exceedingly, much.”

(a) Banjôgî *-zek-*, Ngentê *-zet-* as in Banjôgî : *kan-â-lôm-zek-lai* We will feast (him) much (151). Ngentê : *a-ren-vai-zet-in* He (being) very miserable (142).

(b) Lushei, Zahao *-em-em-*, as in Lushei : *a-du-em-em-a* He desired exceedingly (135).

<sup>1</sup> § 195, and compare *Shô*, § 212.

<sup>2</sup> References here are to the LSI., iii, 3.

(3) With repetitive force. "Again."

- (a) Zahao, Lushei -lê-, Ngentê -le-, as in Lushei : *kan-mû-lê-tâ* We saw him again (136). Cf. T. *slar* again, before the verb, Burmese *lô* to repeat, to do again.  
 (b) Lai -tân-, as in : (*a-lún*) *a-fêim-tân-in* When he had recovered again (in his mind) (123).

This particle may be connected in origin with *tôn* before, previously, as in : *mû-tôn* To have met (or seen) before, (whence : To meet again (now) ?). Compare with this : *ka-mû-tân* (Him) I have found (*i.e.* I see) again (124).

- (d) Zahao -šal-.  
 (e) Banjôgî -nól-, as in : *â-fôr-nól-la* He, gathering together again (150).

(4) With continuative force. "Continuously, always."

- (a) Zahao, Lushei -reñ-, as in Lushei : *i-om-reñ-a-lâm* Thou art always content to be (with me) (136).  
 (b) Ngentê -ziñ-, as in : *i-om-ziñ-a* Thou art always (with me) (143).  
 (c) Lushei -fîn- as in : *a-hláo-fîn-ân-â* She would always fear (Shaha, *Gr.*, 89).

## 2. Causative Infixes

§ 206. The Causative Infix is :—

- (a) Zahao, Lushei -tir ; Banjôgî -tar, -ter ; Lai -tar (= vb. to make).  
 (b) Pânkhû -púi. (Cf. Lushei *pui* to help, to assist.)  
 (c) Zahao -šak, Lakher, -ša (with *pa*- prefixed).

## THE SUBSTANTIVE

### *Elements Standing before the Root*

#### 1. *kâ-, kê-* of Series I

§ 207. *kâ-, kê-* occurs with substantives in Banjôgî, the group having a link here with the Old Kuki languages (Kôm and Ânâl) in Manipur.

<i>kâ-bân</i>	hand.	<i>kâ-kê</i>	foot.
<i>kâ-nâr</i>	nose.	<i>kê-mit</i>	eye.
<i>kâ-kâ</i>	mouth.	<i>kâ-na-ko</i>	ear.
<i>kâ-hâ</i>	tooth.	<i>kâ-tsâm</i>	hair.
<i>kâ-nû</i>	mother.	<i>kâ-nâ</i>	brother.
<i>kâ-pâ-nû</i>	woman.	<i>kâ-tsar-nû</i>	sister.
<i>kâ-nû-pi</i>	wife.	<i>kâ-fâ-pâ</i>	son.
		<i>kâ-fâ-nû</i>	daughter.

This root has now disappeared from among the independent pronouns of the language, *â-mâ*, *â-ni* being now the 3rd personal forms.

## 2. *pa-* (of Series II ?)

§ 208. In the following substantives in Lakher, there occurs a prefix *pa-* which appears to be a pronominal root.

<i>pa-ka</i>	mouth.	<i>pa-ti</i>	liver.
<i>pa-čâ</i>	lungs.	<i>pa-ku</i>	knee.
<i>pa-taṇ</i>	nail, claw, talon.	<i>pa-věo</i>	stomach.
<i>pa-raṇ</i>	finger, toe, root.		

This probably represents a late prefix (cf. forms in Series II), and is quite likely to be the same as Anâl pronominal *pa-*, *pû-*, Hirôî-Lamgâng *pa-*, *po-*, preserved in some instances before verbs. Shô 3rd pers. *pô* may be the same root still retaining its independence.

Since light is thrown upon the pronominal nature of the Lakher prefix by these Old Kuki forms they may be adduced here.

In Anâl we have in *pa-* :—

*čě-wě yo-nâ pa-yo-nû* although he (*pa-*) might wish to eat even husks. (LSI., iii, 3, p. 278.)

*ma-pâ . . . . . ma-dâ-to pa-yo-nû* his father (he, *pa-*) kissed him (*id.*, 278.)

*pa-sol-nû* he was lost (*id.*, 279.)

*tû-hâ mi-nai hě pa-lan-nû* thereupon that servant (he, *pa-*) answered. (*id.*, 279.)

*a-mâ-to ma-pâ-kûn-hâ pa-lan-nû* he to his father (he, *pa-*) replied. (*id.*, 279.)

*ma-pâ . . . . . ma-ča-râ-to pa-n'én-nû* his father . . . . . his son (he, *pa-*) entreated. (*id.*, 279.)

In the following, *pa-* is replaced by *pû-* :—

. . . . . *ma-pû-mâ-wal . . . . .* (all his wealth) . . . he (*ma* + *pû*) wasted. (*id.*, 278.)

. . . . . *pû-ma-fû-nû . . . . .* (his wealth) . . . its (*pû-*) having been wasted. (*id.*, 278.)

It is more than probable, however, that *pû-* is actually in both these cases objective. The sense of the first would then be "he (*ma-*) wasted it (*-pû-*)".

This is supported by the following, in which *pa-* and *b-* are almost certainly objective :—

*a-pa-hěl-wâ* (a garment) upon him (*a-*) put it (*-pa-*) (or, him (*a-*) cause to wear it (*-pa-*)). (*id.*, 279.)

*a-b-nâ-wâ* (upon his hand a ring) upon it (*a-*) put it (*-b-*) (or, him (*a-*) make put it (*-b-*)). (*id.*, 279.)

In Hirôî-Lamgâng we have in *pa-* :—

*ma-mân ma-p-lîn pa-ti-dâ* he in his mind his (*pa-*) being angry. (*id.*, 289, 291.)

*ma-pân wân-tok-dâ ma-mâ pa-tēm-dâ* his father came out and with him he (*pa-*) entreated. (*id.*, 289.)

The form *po-* occurs in :—

. . . . . *po-mân-dâ . . . . .* (all his wealth) . . . he wasted. (*id.*, 288, 289.)

Here, however, *po-* may be objective, and the sense “(he) wasted it (*po-*)”, which is supported by the following instances in which *pa-*, *p-*, are almost certainly objective:—

*a-pa-hil* (a garment) upon him (*a-*) put it (*-pa-*), (or, him (*a-*) cause to wear it (*-pa-*)). (*id.*, 289.)

*a-p-nâ* (upon his hand a ring) upon it (*a-*) put it (*-p-*) (or, him (*a-*) make put it (*-p-*)). (*id.*, 289.)

### 3. *a-* of Series II

§ 209. Of the youngest pronominal prefixes that of the 3rd person, *a-*, tends to become permanently attached to substantives, as may be illustrated by Lai.

*a-pa* father.

*a-nû* mother.

*a-ta* brother.

*a-farr* sister.

## C. SOUTHERN CHIN<sup>1</sup>

### *Preliminary*

§ 210. With regard to transliteration, it may be noted that Houghton's “short acute tone”<sup>2</sup> usual with words ending in *k*, is probably a velar or glottal check, or, in open syllables, a stop. ° is written here for Houghton's ˊ.

The following are instances of its occurrence:—

Shö

Burmese

*wo*° pig.

*wak*.

*bo*° white. For the final cf.

*a-prû*.

Gârô (Âwe) *gi-pok*, Âtong

*pe-bok*, Kôch *pe-bok*, Rugâ

*bok-ô*, Râbhâ *bok-a*, Âhom,

Khâmî, Shân *pûk*.

*a-mi*° eye.

*myak*. Shö (Minbu) *myek*.

*a-po*° grandfather. Cf. for

*a-b'ui*.

the final (?): Shö (Minbu)

*pak-to*.

*s'ê*° eight.

*r'ac*.

## THE VERB

### (a) *Elements Standing before the Root*

#### *a-* of Series II

§ 211. *a-* of the 3rd person is prefixed to adjectives and substantives derived from verb roots.

The derived forms with this prefix show how this language

<sup>1</sup> In this group, Shö only is considered here, as there is great uncertainty as to the value of much of the material thus far gathered on the remaining languages.

<sup>2</sup> *Essay on the Language of the Southern Chins*, p. 12.

draws nearer to Burmese than its relatives further north, in that *a-* derivatives more frequently take a subjective (substantival) turn here, as against an objective (adjectival) sense elsewhere, which is especially the case with Burmese.

Thus, taking Thâdo of the Northern Chin group for comparison, the following are representative cases of this divergence :—

Shö *a-šauh* subst. length (fr. *šauh* to be long), Thâdo *a-sân*,  
*a-šân* adj. long, high, tall.

Shö *a-šo* subst. thickness (fr. *šo* to be thick), Thâdo *a-sá*,  
*a-šá* adj. thick.

Shö *a-b'oi* subst. chief (fr. *poi* to be good), Thâdo *a-pá* adj. good.

### (b) *Elements Standing after the Root*

#### 1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 212. The language has but few of these infixes, among them being :—

-ê- indicating reciprocity or mutuality. This often expresses the same idea as Thâdo *ki-*, Lushei *in-*, prefixed, Shö thus showing the usual tendency of the younger languages to relegate such particles to the back of the verb.<sup>1</sup> The contrast in position is shown in the following.

Shö *pôn-ê* to wrestle (with one another). Thâdo *ki-bôn*, Lushei *in-búan*.

Shö *uô-ê* to quarrel (Lushei *in-tsúal*).

Shö *sü-ê* to assemble (Thâdo *ki-kom*).

Sometimes the force of -ê- is rather reflexive, as in :—

Shö *šan<sup>o</sup>-ê* to be ready, to prepare. Lushei *in-tsiem*.

Shö *šau-ê* to wash (one's head), (Lushei *in-búal* to bathe oneself), Thâdo *ki-šil* to wash (one's body).

#### 2. The Causative Infix -sê-

§ 213. The causative infix -sê- is comparable to Burmese -čê- from *čê* to send, to order.

### THE SUBSTANTIVE

#### *Elements Standing before the Root*

##### *a-* of Series II

§ 214. The 3rd personal element *a-* is regularly prefixed to a large number of true substantives, as representing which we may take :—

<sup>1</sup> Compare especially §§ 5, 98.

Parts of the body <sup>1</sup> :—

<i>a-mi</i> <sup>o</sup>	eye.	<i>a-ho</i>	tooth.
<i>a-n̄ō</i>	ear.	<i>a-s̄ān</i>	hair.
<i>a-lū</i>	head.	<i>a-m-lē-bā</i>	tongue.
<i>a-l'īn</i>	back.		

## Family relationship terms :—

<i>a-pō</i>	father.	<i>a-nū</i>	mother.
<i>a-tā</i>	elder brother.	<i>a-nū-bi</i>	sister.
<i>a-po</i> <sup>o</sup>	grandfather.	<i>a-tū</i>	grandson.

## III. BURMESE

## PRELIMINARY

## A.

§ 215. In the matter of transliteration, the following points may be noticed.

ၼ-ၼ is written *ō* with the long quantity sign, which seems to the writer preferable to the unmarked *o* suggested by Blagden.<sup>2</sup> The length is tacitly assumed by the Burmese, who regard it as having inherent long quantity (—:).

The corresponding vowel in Tibetan is usually either *o* or *u*, as in :—

## T.

<i>kyōn̄</i> to tend (as cattle).	<i>skyōn̄-ba</i> , P. <i>bskyāns</i> , F. <i>bskyān</i> , Imp. ( <i>b</i> ) <i>skyōn̄(s)</i> .
<i>pōk</i> to perforate, to bore a hole.	<i>ābug(s)-pa</i> , P. <i>pūg</i> , F. <i>dbug</i> , Imp. <i>pūg</i> ; also (Pres.) <i>pūg-pa</i> .
<i>a-pōk</i> hole, cavity (fr. <i>pōk</i> to be pierced or perforated).	<i>pūg-pa</i> cavern, <i>ābug</i> awl, punch, chisel, <i>bū-ga</i> (in comp s. > <i>būg</i> ) hole, opening, orifice.
<i>pō</i> to be swelled.	<i>ābo-ba</i> , P. <i>ābos</i> , <i>bo</i> , <i>pō</i> , F. <i>dbo</i> to swell up, to rise ; to sprout, to shoot up or forth. <sup>3</sup>
<i>l'yō</i> to loosen, to relax.	<i>glōd-pa</i> ; cf. also <i>lhōd-pa</i> , <i>lōd</i> loose, relaxed.

<sup>1</sup> In the Chin of the Sandoway District recorded by Fryer (JASB., 1875, pt. i, pp. 68–9), *ma-* here replaces *a-*, and he gives with this prefix :—

<i>ma-n̄'o</i>	ear.	<i>ma-hō</i>	tooth.
<i>ma-lū</i>	head.	<i>ma-s̄om</i>	hair of the head.
<i>ma-l'īn</i>	back.	<i>ma-lē-bon</i>	tongue.

and others. This is *ma-* of Series II (§ 188).

<sup>2</sup> JBRs., iv (1914), pp. 138–9.

<sup>3</sup> With this, however, compare also B. *pā* to appear, to come to light, to rise into view, and *pū* to bud, to swell (as a bud or pimple).

◦ is written *ui* following Blagden<sup>1</sup> and Duroiselle.<sup>2</sup>

Its original sound is doubtful, but judging from the evidence of Tibetan<sup>3</sup> cognates, it may have been something like the Dutch colloquial "ui" in *huis*, *buis* ("höüs", "böüs"), i.e. "ö" with a quickly following "ü" of short quantity, the latter a "high" vowel brought in by a palatalized dental final in process of disappearing, such as may have formerly existed in some of the examples below.

The corresponding vowel in Tibetan is usually *u*, or sometimes *o*, as in the following cases<sup>4</sup> :—

	T.
<i>kui</i> : to steal.	<i>rku-ba</i> <sup>5</sup> P. ( <i>b</i> ) <i>rkus</i> , F. <i>brku</i> , Imp. <i>rkus</i> .
<i>kyui</i> : to wash.	<i>akrud-pa</i> , <i>akru-ba</i> , P. <i>bkrus</i> , F. <i>bkru</i> .
<i>kru</i> : string, cord, rope.	<i>rgyud</i> .
<i>a-rui</i> : bone.	<i>rus-pa</i> .
<i>čui</i> : to be bad, hurtful, or injuriously.	<i>btsog-pa</i> , also ( <i>b</i> ) <i>rtsog(s)-pa</i> unclean, dirty, nasty: > WT. bad, spoiled, injurious.

The conventional Burmese signs have been retained for *ok myit* (◦) and *še pok* (:), which the writer would here protest are not "tone" marks. Not until this fact is squarely faced are we likely to have anything but confused and conflicting accounts of pitch-tones in Burmese. *ok myit* and *še pok* are signs of *quantity* from which is inseparable *stress*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> JBRS., iv (1914), p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> JBRS., vi (1916), p. 84.

<sup>3</sup> The older Tibetan evidence seems to the writer preferable here to that of the younger, and phonetically more unstable, languages of the Lo-lo group and Maru (*v.* Duroiselle, JBRS., vi (1916), p. 84), though the latter is by no means to be neglected.

<sup>4</sup> See also Duroiselle, JBRS., vi (1916), p. 97.

<sup>5</sup> For the final *-n* which this root probably once possessed, see § 55.

<sup>6</sup> See *inter alia* Shwe Zan Aung in the JBRS., vi (1916), p. 59, where this fact, at least, seems to be clearly grasped, though no serious investigation to determine the pitch-tones of Burmese has to my knowledge ever been undertaken which keeps it clearly in the foreground.

Taylor (*Tones of Certain Languages of Burma*, in the Bull. of the School of Oriental Studies, vol. i, pp. 91 *et seqq.*) has for this reason attained but little for Burmese (pp. 99–106), notwithstanding some very excellent remarks, as e.g. concerning the so-called "heavy tone" where it is observed that "everything seems to depend . . . on stress" (*op. cit.*, p. 100).

Indeed, we stand to all intents and purposes just about where we have stood for some thirty years past in the matter of exact knowledge of Burmese tones. Conrady's remarks (*CB.*, 126–8) can hardly be bettered even now.

In Tibetan likewise stress is sometimes particularly clearly developed as an accompaniment of the increased vowel length where a final nasal is lost,

With the investigation of the problem presented by these two signs there is inseparably bound up the nature and changes of final consonants, these—which are so often moves towards final disappearance—having naturally a marked effect upon the preceding vowel. This movement among finals we know to have been already in operation when the language was first given a written form, and the investigation of *ok myit* and *še pok* has to do essentially with the associated phenomena of quantity and stress effecting the vowels.

## B

§ 216. Linking Burmese directly with Kachin and Tibetan, is the non-pronominal prefix *a-*.

This is almost certainly, actually the same element as Kachin *a-* and Tibetan 'a-, as already suggested above (§§ 64, 185, 186), and has, in common with Kachin *a-* a vastly more extended usage than Tibetan 'a-.

Since the original occurrence of 'a- in Tibetan appears to have been before family relationship terms, the prefixes in the following are among the oldest of all, and are all non-pronominal.

	Burmese	Kachin	Lepcha	Tibetan
Father	<i>a-pá</i> <i>a-pê</i>	<i>a-wa</i>	<i>a-bo</i>	'a-pá
Mother	<i>a-mê</i> <i>a-mi</i>	<i>a-nu</i>	<i>a-mo</i> <i>a-mu</i>	'a-ma
Grandfather	<i>a-b' ui:</i>	<i>a-ji</i> (paternal)		'a-mes
Grandmother	<i>a-b' uâ:</i>	<i>a-woi</i>		'a-pyi
Old man	<i>a-b' ui:-kyî:</i>			
Old woman	<i>a-mê-kyî:</i>			'a-pyim
Aunt	<i>a-rî:</i>		<i>a-nyu</i>	
Child	<i>a-ka-lê:</i>	<i>a-ša</i>	<i>a-küp</i>	'a-ka

Naturally, correspondences occur between this element and the various unrelated 3rd personal prefixes of other languages.

In this way the following occur with Mikir *â-* of Series II :—

B.	M.
<i>a-miat</i> (fr. <i>mat</i> to mark).	<i>â-mek, mek</i> subst. mark, sign.
<i>a-čak</i> (fr. <i>čak</i> to connect).	<i>â-sek</i> subst. joint, junction.
<i>a-lap</i> (fr. <i>lap</i> to superimpose).	<i>â-čap</i> subst. layer.
<i>a-puñ</i> (fr. <i>puñ</i> to heap up).	<i>â-bui</i> subst. heap.

as e.g. in *má* (WT.) which is always pronounced " with a marked accent and long vowel " (Jk. D., 408), probably abbreviated from *mañs* " very ".

In an article to appear shortly in the JBRs. the writer is considering Burmese " tones " at greater length. See Bibliography, p. 214.



With Mikir *ke-*, *ki-*, *kā-* of Series I we have :—

B.

M.

*a-r'an* (fr. *r'an* to be alive).      *ke-reñ* adj. living, alive.

Before the same root as *Âo te-* of Series I it occurs in :—

B.

Âo

*a-nak* (fr. *nak* to be dark).      *te-â-nâk* (fr. *â-nâk* to be black) adj. black.

*a-čun̄:* (fr. *čun̄:* to come to an end).      *te-â-tam* (fr. *â-tam* to cease) subst. end.

*a-čup* (fr. *čup* to clutch).      *te-ŷep* (fr. (*â-*)*ŷep* to grasp) subst. cluster, bunch.

*a-sê* (fr. *sê* to die).      *te-â-sa* (fr. *â-sa* to die) adj. dead.

*a-muik* (fr. *muik* to be dark) subst. darkness.      *te-mok* (fr. *mok* to be dull) adj. dull.

## THE VERB

### (a) *Elements Standing before the Root*

#### 1. Subjective or Pronominal Prefixes

§ 217. Direct evidence of the former use by Burmese of pronominal prefixes of the old order with the verb is lacking, but the universal occurrence of aspirated initials in verbs having transitive or causative senses which points to the former existence of directive elements in the language, makes it fairly safe to conclude that subjective prefixes also formerly occurred, since the original and normal Tibeto-Burman verb form could never appear with directive element only.

From the evidence of verb initials, it appears that Burmese may never have passed through a stage of regenerated verb forms with new, substitute, subjective, and objective elements before the verb, such as we find in the Kuki-Chin languages ; it seems rather to have passed directly from a former state, probably approaching Tibetan, to its present lack of prefixes, possibly through an intermediate stage in which, morphologically, it somewhat resembled Kachin.

#### 2. Directive or Objective Infixes

§ 218. That the language once possessed directive infixes, there is more definite proof, the regular aspiration of the initials of verb roots to render them transitive or causative

having long been recognized as indicating the former occurrence of prefixes to accomplish the same end.

It is exactly the same development which is so well known in Tibetan, where *-s-* particularly, assumed the office of passing the verbal action over to a direct object, and it is, indeed, to all appearances, the former presence of this very prefix which the aspirations of Burmese indicate.

In illustration of this we may take the following parallel pairs in Burmese and Kachin, a language in which *ša-*, *ja-* (T. *-s-*) is particularly well in evidence.

B.	K.
1. <i>pyaṅ</i> to be scattered, to be spread. <i>pyaṅ</i> to part, to separate (enemies).	<i>bra</i> to be scattered, to be dispersed. <i>ša-bra</i> to scatter, to disperse.
2. <i>praṅ</i> to be full.  <i>praṅ</i> to fill, to make complete ; to recover one's strength ( <i>ā</i> ).	<i>bran</i> to increase, to grow ; to become convalescent, to recover. <i>ša-bran</i> to revive.
3. <i>pyak</i> to be destroyed, to be ruined. <i>pyak</i> to destroy, to ruin.	<i>bya</i> to be destroyed, demolished, or overthrown. <i>ša-bya</i> to destroy, to ruin.
4. <i>ṇi</i> to catch fire. <i>ṇi</i> to ignite, to kindle, to set fire to.	<i>či</i> to be on fire. <i>ša-či</i> to ignite, to kindle a fire.
5. <i>yut</i> <sup>1</sup> to be inferior, to be mean. <i>r'ut</i> to put down.	<i>grit</i> <sup>1</sup> to be decreased, diminished, or reduced. <i>ša-grit</i> to lower, to humble, to decrease.
6. <i>luṅ</i> to be warm. <i>l'uṅ</i> to warm oneself by a fire.	<i>lum</i> to be warm. <i>ša-lum</i> to heat, to warm (as food).
7. <i>luat</i> to be free or unrestrained, to be at liberty. <i>l'uat</i> to liberate, to set free, to release.	<i>lât</i> to be or become free, to have or gain liberty. <i>ša-lât</i> to liberate, to set free, or release.
8. <i>myam</i> to be decorated.	<i>mân</i> to be adorned, or decorated.

<sup>1</sup> For the *u* : *i* vowel relation, see § 117.

## B.

*m̥yam*: to decorate, to adorn.

9. *mañ* to be named, to have a name, to be called.

*m̥añ* to name, to give a name.

10. *n̥im* to be low.

*n̥im* to make low, to lower.

11. *prut* to boil (tr.); to be unloosed.

*pr̥ut* to unloose, to dislocate, to unharness (a horse).

12. *prañ* to be expanded, unrolled, or spread out.

*pr̥añ* to spread out, to expand.

13. *kyá* to become separate, to be apart.

*kyá* to separate, to part, to sever.

14. *kr̥im*: to be terrified; to threaten, to defy.

*kr̥im*: to threaten (obsolete).

15. *kr̥ók*<sup>1</sup> to fear, to be afraid.

*kr̥ók* to frighten, to scare.

16. *prañ* to be full (v. 2 sup.).

*pr̥añ* to fill, to make full, to complete.

## K.

*ša-m̥an* to decorate, to adorn.

*myiñ* to name; a name.

*ša-mỵiñ* to name, to give a name.

*nem* to be low.

*ša-nem* to make low, to lower.

*prut* to boil; to burst forth, to sprout.

*ša-prut* to blurt out, to boil, to cause to boil and bubble.

*pyan* to unfold, to expand (as a leaf).

*ša-pyan* to unroll, to unfold, to expand.

*kā* to be parted or separated.

*ṣa-kā* to separate, to part.

*kr̥im* to threaten.

*ṣa-kr̥im* to threaten.

*kr̥it*<sup>1</sup> to fear, to be afraid.

*ṣa-kr̥it* to frighten, to scare.

*pr̥iñ* to be full.

*ṣa-pr̥iñ* to fill, to make full.

(b) *Elements Standing after the Root*

1. Descriptive Adverbial Infixes

§ 219. Among elements of this nature (as distinguished from special applications of verb roots, in which Burmese is rich) we have:—

- (1) *-kun-* of entirety = adv. wholly, altogether, all.

*sē-kun-pr̥i* They are all dead.

This infix, which is the same element as the plural suffix *-kun*, is the same root as Tibetan *kun* all, every, whole (B. *a-kun*).

<sup>1</sup> For the final see § 56.

(2) *-l'a-* of intensity = adv. very.

*krî:-l'a-sań* To be very great.

(3) (a) *-û:-* of repetition = adv. more, again.

*sók-û:-mań* (He) will drink again.

(b) *-pran-* of repetition = adv. again.

*pru-pran-sań* To do again, to repeat.

## 2. The Causative Infix *-čê-*

§ 220. The causative infix follows the verb and is *-čê-*.  
*pru-čê-sań* (He) makes (him) do.

## THE SUBSTANTIVE

### *Elements Standing before the Root*

*a-*, non-pronominal

§ 221. We have already considered in § 216 the non-pronominal prefix *a-*, and further than to restate that this element is to be connected with Tibetan 'a- and Kachin *a-*, and does not belong among the pronominal prefixes of the Table in § 188, there is nothing to add here.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Though making no pretence at completeness, it is hoped that this fairly well covers the field.

The titles referring to the Môn-Khmêr and Chinese-Tai Families or individual languages in those Families are given either because they are of fundamental importance in any study of Indo-Chinese languages as a whole, or are standard reference works in a field, account of which must be taken, in more general Tibeto-Burman philological studies.

- ABBEY, W. B. T., *Manual of the Maru Language, including a Vocabulary of over 1,000 words*, Rangoon, 1899.
- ALLEN, B. C., *Gazetteer of the Naga Hills and Manipur*, Assam District Gazetteers, vol. ix, Shillong.
- AMUNDSEN, E., *Primer of Standard Tibetan*, Ghoom, Darjeeling.
- ANDERSON, J. D., *A Collection of Kachiri Folk-Tales and Rhymes, intended as a Supplement to the Rev. S. Endle's Kachári Grammar*, Shillong, 1895.
- *A Short List of Words of the Hill Tippera Language with their English Equivalents; also of Words of the Language spoken by the Lushais of the Sylhet Frontier*, Shillong, 1885.
- *A Short Vocabulary of the Aka Language (English-Aka)*, Shillong, 1896.
- ARMSTRONG, L. E., and PE MAUNG TIN, *A Burmese Phonetic Reader*, London, 1925.
- AVERY, J., *On the Garo Language*, Proc. Am. Orient. Soc., May, 1885, pp. xxv-xxviii (in JAOS., xiii (1889)).
- *On the Language of the Lepchas in Sikkim*, PAOS., Oct., 1885, p. lxxvii (in JAOS., xiii).
- *On the Relationship of the Kachari and Garo Languages of Assam*, PAOS., May, 1887, pp. clviii-clxi (in JAOS., xiii (1889)).
- *The Ao Naga Language of Southern Assam*, Reprint, Am. Journ. of Philology, vol. viii, No. 3.
- BABER, E. C., *Travels and Researches in Western China*, Roy. Geogr. Soc. Supplementary Papers, vol. i (1866), pp. 73-8.
- BACOT, J., *Anthropologie du Tibet; Les Populations du Tibet sud-oriental*, Bull. Soc. d'Anthr. P., 5<sup>e</sup> Série, t. 9, pp. 462-73.
- *L'Écriture Cursive Tibétaine*, Extrait du Journ. Asiat., 1912, pp. 1-78.
- *Les Mo-so. Ethnographie des Mo-so, leurs Religions, leur Langue et leur Écriture*, Leiden, 1913.
- *Les Slokas Grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhota, avec leurs Commentaires*. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études, t. xxxvii, Paris, 1928.
- BAILEY, T. GRAHAM, *Kanauri Vocabulary English-Kanauri and Kanauri-English*. Roy. Asiat. Soc. Monographs, vol. xiii, London, 1911.
- *Languages of the Northern Himalayas, being Studies in the Grammar of twenty-six Himalayan Dialects*. Roy. Asiat. Soc. Monographs, vol. xii, London, 1908.
- *Linguistic Studies from the Himalayas*. Roy. Asiat. Soc. Monographs, vol. xviii, London, 1920.
- BASTIAN, A., *Sprachvergleichende Studien mit besondere Berücksichtigung der indochinesischen Sprachen*, Leipzig, 1870.
- *Über die siamesischen Laut- und Tonaccente*. Monatsber. d. königl. preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Berlin, Gesamtsitzung vom 6 Juni, 1867, pp. 357-86, Berlin, 1868.
- *Völkerstämme am Brahmaputra, und verwandtschaftliche Nachbarn*, Berlin, 1883.

- BEAMES, J., *On the Magar Language of Nepal*, JRAS., vol. iv (1869), pp. 178-228.
- BECKH, H., *Beiträge zur tibetischen Grammatik, Lexicographie, Stilistik und Metrik. Anhang zu den Abhandlungen der königl. preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Berlin*, 1908.
- BELL, C. A., *English Tibetan Colloquial Dictionary*, 2nd ed., Calcutta, 1920.
- *Grammar of Colloquial Tibetan*, 2nd ed., Calcutta, 1919.
- BIET, A., *Vocabulaire Lyssou, recueilli à Tsékou . . . . ., avec Vocabulaire Lyssou-français par de Crozier, Saint-Quentin*, 1879.
- BINNEY, Mrs. J. P., *Anglo-Karen Dictionary*, Rangoon, 1883.
- BLAGDEN, C. O., *Klañ-jo-Kyei-zā*, JBRS., vol. vi (1916), pp. 92-5.
- *The Transliteration of Old Burmese Inscriptions*, JBRS., vol. iv (1914), pp. 136-9.
- BOELL, P., *Contribution à l'Étude de la Langue Lolo*, Paris, 1899.
- BOLLER, A., *Die Präfixe mit vocalischem und gutturalem Anlaute in den einsilbigen Sprachen*, Wien, 1869.
- BOR, N. L., and J. H. HUTTON, *The Use of Tones in Sema Naga*, JRAS., 1927, pp. 103-9.
- BORUA, RAI SAHIB GOLAP CHANDRA, *Ahom-Assamese-English Dictionary*, Calcutta, 1920.
- BRANDRETH, E. L., *On the Non-Aryan Languages of India*, JRAS., vol. x (1877), pp. 1-32.
- BRIDGES, J. E., *Burmese Grammar*, Rangoon, 1915.
- *Burmese Manual*, London, 1906.
- BROWN, N., *Specimens of the Naga Language of Assam*, JAOS., ii (1851), pp. 157-65.
- BROWN, R. GRANT, *Half the Battle in Burmese*, Oxford, 1910.
- *The Kadus of Burma*, Bull. School of Oriental Studies, London Institution, vol. i, pt. iii (1920), pp. 1-28.
- BROWN, W. B., *Outline Grammar of the Deori Chutiya Language*, Shillong, 1895.
- BUSHELL, S. W., *The Early History of Tibet from Chinese Sources*, Reprint, JRAS., October, 1880.
- CADIÈRE, L., *Phonétique Annamite, Dialecte du Haut-Annam*, Publications de l'École française d'Extr.-Orient., vol. iii, Paris, 1902.
- CAMPBELL, G., *Specimens of the Languages of India, including those of the Aboriginal Tribes of Bengal, Central Provinces, and the Eastern Frontier*, Calcutta, 1874.
- CARTWRIGHT, B. O., *A Siamese-English Dictionary*, Bangkok, 1907.
- *Siamese Grammar*, Bangkok, 1905.
- CHASE, D. A., *Anglo-Burmese Handbook, or Guide to a Practical Knowledge of the Burmese Language*, Rangoon, 1890.
- CHUCKURBUTTY, RAMNATH, *Vocabulary of the Garo Language*, Calcutta, 1867.
- CLARK, E. W., *Ao Naga Dictionary*, Calcutta, 1911.
- *A Specimen of the Zoongee (or Zurngee) Dialect of a Tribe of Nagas*, JRAS., vol. xi (1879), pp. 278-86.
- Mrs. E. W., *Ao Naga Grammar, with Illustrative Phrases and Vocabulary*, Shillong, 1893.
- CLAUSON, G. L. M., and S. YOSHITAKE, *On the Phonetic Value of the Tibetan Characters ʼṣ and ʼṣ and the Equivalent Characters in the ḥPhags-pa Alphabet*, JRAS., 1929, pp. 843-62.
- CLERK, F. V., *A Manual of the Lawngwaw or Māru Language*, Rangoon, 1911.
- COCHRANE, W. W., *The Shans*, Rangoon, 1915.
- CONRADY, A., *Das Newāri : Grammatik und Sprachproben*, ZDMG., Bd. 45 (1891), pp. 1-35.
- *Der allichinesische Fragesatz und der steigende Ton*, Mitt. d. Sem. Orient. Spr., Jhrg. xviii, pp. 261-97, Berlin, 1915.

- CONRADY, A., *Eine indochinesische Causativ-Denominativ Bildung, und ihre Zusammenhang mit den Tonaccenten. Eine Beitrag zur vergl. Grammatik der indochinesischen Sprachen, insonderheit des Tibetischen, Barmanischen und Siamesischen*, Leipzig, 1896.
- CORDIER, H., *Les Mo-sos*, Acad. des Inscript. et Belles-Lettres, 28 August, 1908, pp. 664-88 and plates.
- CORDIER, P., *Cours de tibétain classique*, Hanoi, 1907.
- CSOMA DE KORÖS, A., *Analyse du Kandjour et du Tandjour*, Annales du Musée Guimet, t. ii (1881), pp. 131-577.
- *Grammar of the Tibetan Language*, Calcutta, 1834.
- *Csoma de Koros Memorial Volume*, being reprints of his articles in the Journ. Asiat. Soc. Beng., Journ. and Proc. Asiat. Soc. Beng., vol. vii (1911), Extra No.
- *Tibetan-English Dictionary*, Calcutta, 1834.
- CUSHING, J. N., *Elementary Handbook of the Shan Language*, Rangoon, 1906.
- *Grammar of the Shan Language*, Rangoon, 1887.
- *Grammatical Sketch of the Kachyen Language*, JRAS., xii (1880), pp. 359-81.
- *Shan and English Dictionary*, Rangoon, 1881.
- CUST, R. N., *A Sketch of the Modern Languages of the East Indies*, London, 1878.
- DAMANT, G. H., *Notes on the Locality and Population of the Tribes dwelling between the Brahmaputra and Ningthi Rivers*, JRAS., xii (1880), pp. 228-57.
- DAS, SARAT CHANDRA, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*, Calcutta, 1902.
- *An Introduction to the Grammar of the Tibetan Language, with the Texts of Si-Tuñ sum-rtags, Dag-je Sal-war me-long and Si-Tuñ Shal-luñ*, Darjeeling, 1915.
- DAVIES, H. R., *Yun-nan, the Link between India and the Yangtze*, Cambridge, 1909.
- DAWA-SAMDUP (KAZI), *Tantrik Texts*, vol. vii, *Shrīchakrasambhāra Tantra*, Ed. A. Avalon, London and Calcutta, 1919.
- *Tantrik Texts*, vol. xi, *Dem-chog Tantra*, Ed. A. Avalon, Darjeeling, 1918.
- DESGODINS, A., *Dictionnaire Thibétain-Latin-Français*, par les Missionnaires Catholiques du Thibet, Hongkong, 1899.
- *Essai de Grammaire Thibétaine pour le Langage parlé*, Hongkong, 1899.
- DEVÉRIA, G., *L'Écriture du Royaume Si-Hia ou Tangout*, Acad. d. Inscr. et Belles Lettres, Paris, 1898.
- *Les Lolo et les Miao Tszé*. Reprint from Journ. Asiat., Paris, 1891.
- DRAGUNOV, A., *Contribution to the Reconstruction of Ancient Chinese*, T'oung Pao, vol. xxvi (1928), pp. 1-16.
- DUNBAR, G. DUFF-SUTHERLAND, *Abors and Galongs*, Memoirs Asiat. Soc. Beng., vol. v, Extra No., Calcutta, 1915-16.
- DUNDAS, W. C. M., *An Outline Grammar and Dictionary of the Kachari (Dimas) Language*, Shillong, 1908.
- DUROISSELLE, C., *Extract from the Burmese Face of the Myazedi Inscription* JBRS., vol. vi (1916), pp. 203-5.
- *Klañ-jo-kye-zū*, JBRS., vol. v (1915), pp. 98-102; vol. vi (1916), pp. 95-8.
- *Literal Transliteration of the Burmese Alphabet*, JBRS., vol. vi (1916), pp. 81-90.
- *The Burmese Face of the Myazedi Inscription at Pagan*, Epigraphia Birmanica, vol. i, part i, pp. 1-46, Rangoon, 1919.
- ENDLE, S., *Outline Grammar of the Kachari (Bārā) Language*, Shillong, 1884.
- *The Kachāris*, London, 1911.

- ENQUIREZ, C. M., *Colloquial Yünnanese. A Survey of Yünnanese Language as spoken on parts of the North-East Burmese Frontier*, Calcutta, 1919.
- FORBES, C. J. F. S., *Comparative Grammar of the Languages of Further India; a Fragment*, London, 1881.
- *On Tibeto-Burman Languages*, JRAS., vol. x (1878), pp. 210–27.
- FORCHHAMMER, E., *Indo-Chinese Languages*, Indian Antiquary, xi (1882), Bombay.
- FORKE, A., *Der Ursprung der Chinesen auf Grund ihrer Bilderschrift*, Hamburg, 1925.
- FOUCAUX, P. E., *Grammaire de la Langue Tibétaine*, Paris, 1858.
- FRANCKE, A. H., *A History of Western Tibet*, London, 1907.
- *A Language Map of West Tibet*, with Notes and Plate, Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, 1904, pp. 362–7.
- *Das tibetische Pronominalsystem*, ZDMG., Bd. lxi (1907), p. 439 ff.; u. Nachtrag, p. 950.
- *Der Frühlingsmythus der Kesarsage. Ein Beitrag zur vorbuddhist. Religion Tibets*, Mém. Soc. Finno-Ougrienne, t. xv, 1 (1900), Helsingfors, 1902.
- *Der Wintermythus der Kesarsage. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Vorbuddhist. Religion Ladaks*, Mém. Soc. Finno-Ougrienne, t. xv, 2 (1902), Helsingfors, 1902.
- *Die Respektsprache im Ladaker tibetischen Dialekt*, ZDMG., Bd. 52 (1898), pp. 275–81.
- *Drei weitere Blätter des tibetischen Losbuches von Turfan*, Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch., 1928, viii (= pp. 110–18).
- *Historische Dokumente von Khalatse in West. Tibet (Ladak)*, ZDMG., Bd. lxi (1907), pp. 583–614.
- *Kleine Beiträge zur Phonetik und Grammatik des tibetischen*, ZDMG., Bd. 57 (1903), pp. 285–98.
- *Ladakhi Songs*, Series i–v, Leh, 1899–1903.
- *Ladwags rGyalrabs*, JASB., vol. vi (n.s.), No. 8 (1910), pp. 393–423.
- *Sketch of Ladakhi Grammar*, JASB., vol. lxx (n.s.), pt. i, Extra No. 2, Calcutta, 1901.
- *Tabellen der Pronomina und Verba in den drei Sprachen Lahouls: Bunan, Manchad und Tinan*, ZDMG., Bd. 63 (1909), pp. 65–97.
- *The Paladins of the Kesar-Saga: A Collection of Sagas from Lower Ladakh*. Preface and Tale 1 in JASB., vol. ii (n.s.) (1906), pp. 467–90; Tale 2, *id.*, vol. iii, No. 2 (1907), pp. 67–77; Tale 3, *id.*, vol. iii, No. 5 (1907), pp. 261–319; Tale 4, *id.*, vol. iii, No. 5, pp. 321–79; Tale 5, *id.*, vol. iii, No. 5, pp. 381–8.
- *Tibetan Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, JRAS., 1914, pp. 37–59.
- *Tibetan Inscription on the Stone Monument in front of the Ta-chao-ssu Temple in Lhasa, 822 A.D.*, Epigraphia Indica, 10, pp. 89–93.
- *Tibetische Handschriftenfunde aus Turfan*. Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch., Philosoph.-histor. Kl., 31 Januar, 1924.
- *Vokabular der Manchadsprache*, ZDMG., Bd. 71 (1917), pp. 137–61.
- *Weitere tibetische Handschriftenfunde von Turfan*. Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch., Philosoph.-histor. Kl., 15 Mai, 1924.
- FRANKFURTER, O., *Elements of Siamese Grammar*, Bangkok, 1900.
- FRASER, J. O., *Handbook of the Lisu (Yawyin) Language*, Rangoon, 1922.
- FRYER, C. E., *On the Khyeng People of Sandoway District, Arakan* (with Grammatical Notes and Vocabulary), JASB., 1875, pt. i, pp. 39–82.
- FURNESS, W. H., *The Ethnography of the Nagas of Eastern Assam*, Journ. Roy. Anthropol. Inst., vol. xxxii (1902), pp. 457–66.
- GAIT, Sir E. A., *A History of Assam*, 2nd ed., Calcutta, 1926.
- GILHODES, C., *The Kachins: Religion and Customs*, Calcutta, 1922.
- GRAHAM, W. A., *Siam: A Handbook of Practical Commercial and Political Information*, Chicago, 1913.



- GRIERSON, Sir GEORGE A., *Kadu and its Relatives*, Bull. School of Oriental Studies, London Institution, vol. ii (1921), pt. i, pp. 39-42.
- Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. I, Part 1, *Introductory*, Calcutta, 1927.
- Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. I, Part 2, *Comparative Vocabulary*, Calcutta, 1928.
- Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. II, *Mōn-Khmēr and Siamese-Chinese Families (including Khasi and Tai)*, Calcutta, 1904.
- Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. III, *Tibeto-Burman Family*, Part I, *General Introduction, Specimens of the Tibetan Dialects, the Himalayan Dialects and the North Assam Group*, Calcutta, 1909.
- Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. III, Part 2, *Specimens of the Bodo, Nāgā, and Kachin Groups*, Calcutta, 1903.
- Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. III, Part 3, *Specimens of the Kuki-Chin and Burma Groups*, Calcutta, 1904.
- *Notes on Ahom*, ZDMG., Bd. 56 (1902), pp. 1-59.
- *Vocal Harmony in Karen*, JRAS., 1920, pp. 347-8.
- GRUBE, W., *Die Sprachgeschichtliche Stellung des Chinesischen*, Leipzig, 1881.
- GRÜNWEDEL, A., *A Kóng-English Glossary* (Reprint from T'oung Pao), Leiden, 1892.
- *Drei Leptscha Texte, mit Auszügen aus dem Padma-thaṅ-yig und Glossar* (Reprint from T'oung Pao), Leiden.
- *Ein Kapitel des Ta-she-sung*, Sonder-Abdruck aus der Bastian-Festschrift, Berlin, 1896.
- *Padmasambhava und Mandārava*, ZDMG., Bd. 52 (1898), pp. 447-61.
- GURDON, P. R. T., *The Morāns*, Journ. Asiat. Soc. Beng., vol. lxxiii (1904), pt. 1, No. 1, pp. 36-48.
- GYA-TSHO, URGYAN (LAMA), *Tibetan Primer*, No. 3, Revised by Lama Lobzang Migyur, 3rd ed., Darjeeling, 1924. (For Nos. 1 and 2, see WANGDAN.)
- HACKIN, J., *Formulaire Sanskrit-Tibétain du Xe Siècle*. Mission Pelliot, Série petit in-8, t. ii, Paris, 1924.
- HAMILTON, R. C., *An Outline Grammar of the Dafla Language as spoken by the Tribes immediately South of the Apa Tanang Country*, Shillong, 1900.
- HANNAH, H. B., *A Grammar of the Tibetan Language, literary and colloquial, with copious illustrations, and treating fully of spelling, pronunciation, and the construction of the verb, and including appendices of the various forms of the verb*, Calcutta, 1912.
- HANSON, O., *A Dictionary of the Kachin Language*, Rangoon, 1906.
- *A Grammar of the Kachin Language*, Rangoon, 1896.
- *The Kachins: Their Customs and Traditions*, Rangoon, 1913.
- HENDERSON, V. C., and E. AMUNDSEN, *Tibetan Manual with Vocabulary*, Calcutta, 1903.
- HERTZ, H. F., *A Practical Handbook of the Kachin or Chingpaw Language*, Rangoon, 1911.
- HODGSON, B. H., *Essays on the Languages, Literature, and Religion of Nepāl and Tibet*, London, 1874.
- *Miscellaneous Essays relating to Indian Subjects*, 2 vols., London, 1880.
- HODSON, T. C., *Note on the Numerical Systems of the Tibeto-Burman Dialects*, JRAS., 1913, pp. 315-36.
- *Note on the word for "Water" in Tibeto-Burman Dialects*, JRAS., 1914, pp. 143-50.
- *Thado Grammar*, Shillong, 1905.
- *The Meithei*, London, 1908.
- *The Nāga Tribes of Manipur*, London, 1911.
- HOERNLE, A. F. R., *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, vol. 1, pts. 1 and 2, Oxford, 1916.
- HOUGHTON, B., *Essay on the Language of the Southern Chins and its Affinities*, Rangoon, 1892.
- *Kami Vocabularies*, JRAS., 1895, pp. 111-38.

- HOUGHTON, B., *Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Palaeontology*, JRAS., 1896, pp. 23-55.
- *Southern Chin Vocabulary (Minbu District)*, JRAS., vol. xxvii (1895), pp. 727-37.
- *The Arakanese Dialect of the Burman Language*, JRAS., 1897, pp. 453-61.
- HUNTER, W. W., *Comparative Dictionary of the Non-Aryan Languages of India and High Asia*, London, 1868.
- HUTCHINSON, R. H. SNEYD, *Vocabulary of the Lushai Language*, Calcutta, 1897.
- HUTH, G., *Die Inschriften von Tsaghan Baisin ; Tibetisch-Mongolischer Text mit einer Übersetzung*, Leipzig, 1894.
- *Verzeichniss der im tibetischen Tanjur, Abtheilung mdo (Sātra), Bände 117-24, enthaltenen Werke*, Sitzungsber. d. königl. preussischen Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Berlin, 1895, xv, pp. 267-86.
- HUTTON, J. H., *Rudimentary Grammar of the Sema Naga Language*, Shillong, 1916.
- *The Angami Nagas, with some Notes on Neighbouring Tribes*, London, 1921.
- *The Sema Nagas*, London, 1921.
- JASCHKE, H. A., *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*, London, 1881.
- *Tibetan Grammar*, London, 1883 (and 3rd ed. (Francke-Simon), Berlin, 1929).
- *Über das tibetische Lautsystem*, Monatsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Berlin, Nachtrag zur Gesamtsitzung vom 12 Januar, 1860, pp. 257-79.
- *Über die Phonetik der tibetischen Sprache*, Monatsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Berlin, 1867 ; Nachtrag, pp. 148-82.
- JOORMAN, H., *Chin Grammar*, Rangoon, 1906.
- JØRGENSEN, H., *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Nevārī-Sprache*, Acta Orientalia, vi (1927-8), pp. 26-92.
- JOSHĪ, TIKĀ RĀM, *A Grammar and Dictionary of Kanāwari*, Journ. and Proc. Asiat. Soc. Beng., vol. v (1909), Extra No., Calcutta, 1909.
- JUDSON, A., *A Grammar of the Burmese Language*, Rangoon, 1888.
- *Burmese-English Dictionary*, Revised and enlarged by R. C. Stevenson, Rangoon, 1893.
- *English and Burmese Dictionary*, 4th ed., Rangoon, 1894.
- KARLGREN, B., *A Mandarin Phonetic Reader in the Pekinese Dialect*, Archives d'Études Orientales, vol. xiii, Upsala, 1917.
- *Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*, Paris, 1923.
- *Contributions à l'Analyse des Caractères chinois*, Hirth Anniversary Volume, Asia Minor, Introductory Volume, pp. 206-21.
- *Études sur la Phonologie chinoise*, 4 fasc. ; Arch. d'Études Orient. 12, 13, 19, 24, Upsala, 1915-26.
- *Le Proto-chinois, Langue flexionnelle*, Journ. Asiat., 1920 (Avril-Juin), pp. 205-32.
- *On the Authenticity and Nature of the Tso Chuan*, Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, xxxii (1926), 3, Göteborg, 1926.
- *Ordet och Pennan i Mittens Rike*, Stockholm, 1918 (Translated as *Sound and Symbol in Chinese*, London, 1923).
- *Philology and Ancient China*, Oslo, 1926, Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, Serie A : Forelesninger viii.
- *Problems in Archaic Chinese*, JRAS., 1928, pp. 769-813.
- *Pronunciation ancienne des Caractères chinois figurant dans les Transcriptions Bouddhiques*, T'oung Pao, vol. xix (1918-19), pp. 104-21.
- *The Reconstruction of Ancient Chinese*, T'oung Pao, vol. xxi (1922), pp. 1-42.

- KAY, S. P., *An English-Mikir Vocabulary*, Shillong, 1904.
- KEITH, T. J., *Dictionary of the Garo Language: Garo and Bengali-English*, Jalpaiguri, 1873.
- *Outline Grammar of the Garo Language*, Sibsagar, 1874.
- KO, TAW SEIN, *Elementary Handbook of the Burmese Language*, Rangoon, 1913.
- KONOW, STEN, *Note on the Languages spoken between the Assam Valley and Tibet*, JRAS., 1902, pp. 127–37.
- *Notes on the Maghī Dialect of the Chittagong Hill Tracts*, ZDMG., Bd. 57 (1903), pp. 1–12.
- *On some Facts connected with the Tibeto-Burman Dialect spoken in Kanawar*, ZDMG., Bd. 59 (1905), pp. 717–25.
- *Zur Kenntnis der Kuki-Chin Sprachen*, ZDMG., Bd. 56 (1902), pp. 486–517.
- KUHN, E., *Beiträge zur Sprachenkunde Hinterindiens*, Sitzungsber. d. königl. bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch.; Philosoph.-histor.-Klasse I, pp. 189–236, München, 1889.
- *Die Sprache der Singpho oder Ka-khyen* (Sonder-Abdruck aus der Bastian-Festschrift), Berlin, 1896.
- *Über Herkunft und Sprache der transgangetischen Völker*, Festrede, Sitzungsber. d. königl. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu München, 1881, München, 1883.
- LATHAM, R. G., *Elements of Comparative Philology*, London, 1862.
- LATTER, T., *A Grammar of the Language of Burma*, Calcutta and London, 1845.
- LAUFER, B., *Bird Divination among the Tibetans: Notes on Document Pelliot No. 3530, with a Study of Tibetan Phonology of the ninth century*, T'oung Pao, vol. xv (1914), pp. 1–110.
- *Chinese Transcriptions of Tibetan Names*, T'oung Pao, vol. xvi (1915), pp. 420–4.
- *Der Roman einer tibetischen Königin Tibetischer Text und Übersetzung*, Leipzig, 1911.
- *Ein Sühngedicht der Bonpo*, Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosoph.-histor. Klasse, Bd. xlv, Hft. vii, Wien, 1900.
- *Klu, bum bsul us pai snin po. Eine verkürzte Version des Werkes von den hunderttausend Nagas. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der tibetischen Volksreligion.* Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, xi, Helsingfors, 1898.
- *Loan Words in Tibetan*, T'oung Pao, vol. xvii (1916), pp. 403–552.
- *Origin of Tibetan Writing*, JAOS., vol. xxxviii (1918), pp. 34–46.
- *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft der Tibeter; Zarnatog.* Sitzungsber. der königl. bayer. Akad. der Wissensch., Philosoph.-histor. Kl., 1898, Bd. i, pp. 519–94.
- *The Prefix a- in the Indo-Chinese Languages*, JRAS., 1915, pp. 757–80.
- *The Si-Hia Language: A Study in Indo-Chinese Philology*, T'oung Pao, vol. xvii (1916), pp. 1–126.
- *Über das Va Zur; Beiträge zur Phonetik und Grammatik des tibet. Sprache*, Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Bd. xii (1898), pp. 298 ff., Bd. xiii (1899), pp. 95 ff., 199 ff.
- LEGENDRE, A. F., *Far West Chinois: Races aborigènes. Les Lolos: Étude ethnologique et anthropologique*, Leiden, 1909.
- LEPSIUS, R., *Über chinesische und tibetische Lautverhältnisse und über die Umschrift jener Sprachen*, Monatsber. der preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Berlin, Sitzung d. Philosoph.-histor. Kl. vom 5 März, 1860, pp. 449–96, Berlin, 1861.
- LEWIN, T. H., *Progressive Colloquial Exercises in the Lushei Dialect*, Calcutta, 1874.

- LIÉTARD, A., *Au Yun-nan, les Lo-lo p'o, une Tribu des Aborigènes de la Chine meridionale*, Anthropol., i, 5, Munster, 1913.
- — — *Essai de Dictionnaire Lo-lo-français, reproduisant le Dialecte parlé par le Tribu des A-hi*, T'oung Pao, t. xii (1911), pp. 1-37, 123-56, 316-46, 544-58.
- — — *Notes sur les Dialectes Lo-lo*, BEFEO., t. ix (1909), fasc. 3, pp. 549-72.
- — — *Notions de Grammaire Lo-lo, Dialecte A-hi*, BEFEO., t. ix (1909), fasc. 2, pp. 285-314.
- — — *Notions de Grammaire Lo-lo, Dialecte A-hi*, T'oung Pao, t. xii (1911), pp. 627-62.
- LONSDALE, A. W., *Burmese Grammar and Grammatical Analysis*, Rangoon, 1899.
- LORRAIN, J. H., *A Dictionary of the Abor-Miri Language*, Shillong, 1907.
- — — and F. W. SAVIDGE, *Grammar and Dictionary of the Lushei Language*, Shillong, 1898.
- LOWIS, C. C., *The Tribes of Burma*, Ethnographical Survey of India, Burma No. 4, Rangoon, 1919.
- LYALL, C. J., and E. STACK, *The Mikirs*, London, 1908.
- MACDONALD, A., and MADHUNATH G. MOMIN, *A Garo-English Dictionary*, Shillong, 1910.
- MACNABB, D. J. C., *Manual of the Bauungshe (Lai) Dialect as spoken in the Southern Chin Hills*, Rangoon, 1891.
- MAINWARING, G. B., *A Grammar of the Rong (Lepcha) Language as it exists in the Dorgeling and Sikim Hills*, Calcutta, 1876.
- — — and A. GRUNWEDEL, *Dictionary of the Lepcha Language*, Berlin 1898.
- MANEN, J. VAN, *A Contribution to the Bibliography of Tibet*, Journ. and Proc. Asiat. Soc. Beng., vol. xviii (1922), No. 8. Also published separately, 16th Nov., 1923.
- — — *Minor Tibetan Texts, Primarily Lexicographically Treated. I: The Song of the Eastern Snow-mountain*, Bibliotheca Indica (Asiatic Soc. Beng.), Calcutta, 1919.
- MARRE, A., *Sur le District montagneux de l'Arakan et sur (ses) Habitants, suivi d'un Vocabulaire comparatif des Langues des Tchins, des Tchandós et des Kamis*, Louvain (Tir. à part), 1883.
- MARSHALL, H. I., *The Karen People of Burma*, Ohio State Univ. Bulletins, vol. xxvi, No. 13, Columbus, Ohio, 1922.
- MASON, M. C., BOND and MODHUNATH, *English-Garo Dictionary* (by Members of the Garo Mission of the American Baptist Missionary Union, Tura, Assam), Shillong, 1905.
- MASPERO, H., *Contribution à l'Etude du Système phonétique des Langues Thai*, BEFEO., t. xi (1911), pp. 153-69.
- — — *Études sur la Phonétique historique de la Langue annamite: Les Initiales*, BEFEO., t. xii (1912), fasc. 1.
- — — *Le Dialecte de T'chang-Ngan sous les T'ang*, BEFEO., t. xx (1920), fasc. 2.
- — — *Sur quelques Textes anciens de Chinois parlé*, BEFEO., t. xiv (1914), fasc. 4.
- MCCABE, R. B., *Outline Grammar of the Angami Naga Language*, Calcutta, 1887.
- MCCULLOCH, W., *Account of the Valley of Manipore, and of the Hill Tribes, with a Comparative Vocabulary of the Manipore and other Languages*. Selections from the Records of the Government of India (Foreign Dept.), No. xxvii, Calcutta, 1859.
- MILLS, J. P., *Folk Stories in Lhota Naga*, Journ. and Proc. Asiat. Soc. Beng., vol. xxii (1926), No. 5, Calcutta, 1928.
- — — *The Ao Nagas*, London, 1926.
- — — *The Lhota Nagas*, London, 1922.
- MIX, H. W., *English and Shan Dictionary*, Rangoon, 1920.

- MINGYUR, (LAMA) LOBZANG and E. DENNISON ROSS, *Matriculation Course in Classical Tibetan*, Calcutta, 1911.
- MORISSE, G., *Contribution préliminaire à l'Étude de l'Écriture et de la Langue Si-Hia*, Acad. des Inscr. et Belles Lettres, Paris, 1904, pt. 2, pp. 313-79.
- MULLIE, J., *Une Caractéristique phonologique du Dialecte chinois de la Mongolie Centrale*, T'oung Pao, vol. xxiii (1924), pp. 67-82.
- NAYLOR, L. B., *A Practical Handbook of the Chin Language (Siyin Dialect)*, Rangoon, 1925.
- NEEDHAM, F. J., *A Collection of a few Moshang Naga Words*, Shillong, 1897.
- NEEDHAM, J. F., *Outline Grammar of the Shanyang Mivi Language as spoken in the neighbourhood of Sadiya*, Shillong, 1886.
- *Outline Grammar of the Singpho Language*, Shillong, 1889.
- NEIGHBOR, R. E., *A Vocabulary in English and Mikir*, Calcutta, 1878.
- NEVSKY, NICOLAS, *A Brief Manual of the Si-Hia Characters with Tibetan Transcriptions*, Research Review of the Osaka Asiatic Society, No. 4, March, 1926.
- NEWLAND, A. G. E., *A Practical Handbook of the Language of the Lais*, Rangoon, 1897.
- OVERMILLER, E., *Indices Verborum Sanscrit-Tibetan and Tibetan-Sanscrit to the Nyiyabindu of Dharmakīrti and the Nyiyabindutīkā of Dharmottara. I. Sanscrit-Tibetan Index*, Bibliotheca Buddhica xxiv, Leningrad, 1927. II. *Tibetan-Sanskrit Index*, 1928.
- OLLONE, Ct. D', *Écritures des Peuples non-chinois de la Chine; Quatre Dictionnaires Lolo et Miao Tseu*, Mission d'Ollone, t. vii, Paris, 1912.
- Fleurelle, Lepage et de Boyve, *Langues des Peuples non-chinois de la Chine*, Mission d'Ollone, t. vi, Paris, 1912.
- OWEN, J., *Notes on the Naga Tribes in Communication with Assam*, Calcutta, 1884.
- PEAL, S. E., *Eastern Nagas of the Tirak and Namtsik*, Journ. Asiat. Soc. Beng., 1896, pt. iii, pp. 9-17.
- *Notes on a Visit to the Tribes inhabiting the Hills south of Sibsagar*, Journ. Asiat. Soc. Beng., xii (1872), pt. i, No. 1, p. 9 sq.
- PELLIOT, P., *Notes à propos d'un Catalogue du Kanjur*, Journ. Asiat., t. iv (XI<sup>e</sup> Série), 1914, pp. 111-50.
- PETTIGREW, W., *Manipuri (Mitei) Grammar*, Allahabad, 1912.
- *Tangkhal Naga Grammar and Dictionary (Ukhrul Dialect)*, Shillong, 1918.
- PHILLIPS, E., *Outline Grammar of the Garo Language*, Shillong, 1904.
- PLAYFAIR, A., *The Garos*, London, 1909.
- PRIMROSE, A. J., *Manipuri Grammar, Vocabulary and Phrase-Book*, Shillong, 1888.
- PRZYLUCKI, J., *Les Formes pronominales de l'Annamite*, BEFEO., t. xii (1912), fasc. 8, pp. 5-9.
- RAMKHE, M., *Bengali-Garo-English Dictionary*, Tura, Assam, 1887.
- RIVENBURG, S. W., *Phrases in English and Angami Naga*, Shillong and Kohima, 1905.
- ROCKHILL, W. W., *Notes on the Ethnology of Tibet*, Washington, 1895.
- ROSE, A., and J. C. BROWN, *Lisu (Yawyin) Tribes of the Burma-China Frontier*, Mem. Asiat. Soc. Beng., iii, 4, Calcutta, 1910.
- ROSTHORN, A. DE, *On some Border Tribes of Eastern Tibet*, Actes du X<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Orientalistes, Section vii, pp. 49-61, Leiden, 1896.
- ROSTHORN, A. VON, *Vokabularfragmente ost-tibetischer Dialekte*, ZDMG., Bd. 51 (1897), pp. 524-33.
- RUNDALL, F. M., *Manual of the Siyin Dialect spoken in the Northern Chin Hills*, Rangoon, 1891.
- SAINSON, C., *Nan-Tchao Ye-Che; Histoire particuliere du Nan-Tchao; Traduction d'une Histoire de l'ancien Yun-nan*. Publications de l'École des Langues Orientales Vivantes, Paris, 1904.

- NANDBERG, GRAHAM, *Manual of the Sikkim Bhutia Language or Dénjong Ké*, London (Westminster), 1895.
- SAVIDGE, F. W., *A Grammar and Dictionary of the Lakher Language*, Allahabad, 1908.
- SAVINA, F. M., *Dictionnaire miao-tseu-français, précédé d'un Précis de Grammaire miao-tseu et suivi d'un Vocabulaire français-miao-tseu*, BEFEO., t. xvi (1917), fasc. 2.
- SCHERMAN, L., *Völkerkundliche Notizen aus Oberbirma. I. Die Maring*, Sitzungsber. d. königl. bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu München, Philosoph.-philolog. und histor. Klasse, 1911 (9 Abh.).
- SCHIEFNER, A., *Tibetische Studien*, Bulletin historico-philologique de l'Académie de St. Pétersbourg, t. viii (1851); I. *Über die stummen Buchstaben*, Jan. 10, 1851, cols. 212-22, 259-67; II. *Beiträge zur tibetischen Lautlehre*, Feb. 7, cols. 267-72, 292-304, 333-4, 337-40. III. *Über die sogenannte tibetischen Artikel*, Mar. 21, cols. 341-52.
- *Über die logischen und grammatischen Werke im Tanjur*, Bulletin de la Classe historico-philologique de l'Académie de St. Pétersbourg, t. iv (1848), pp. 284-302.
- *Über Pluralbezeichnungen im Tibetischen*, Mémoires de l'Académie, Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg, VII<sup>e</sup> Série, t. xxv (1877) No. 1, pp. 5-17.
- SCHLAGINTWEIT, E., *Das Mahāyāna Sutra (Tibet)*, Sitzungsber. d. königl. bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu München., Philosoph.-philolog. Kl., 1863, i, pp. 81-99.
- *Glossary of Tibetan Geographical Terms*, JRAS., vol. xx (1863), pp. 67-98.
- *Tibetische Inschrift aus dem Kloster Hémis in Ladāk*, Sitzungsber. d. königl. bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu München., Philosoph.-philolog. Kl., 1864, ii, pp. 305-18.
- SCHLEIERMACHER, A., *De l'Influence de l'Écriture sur le Langage, suivi de Grammaires birmane et malaie*, Darmstadt, 1835.
- SCHMIDT, J. J., *Grammatik der tibetischen Sprache*, St. Petersburg u. Leipzig, 1839.
- *Tibetisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, St. Petersburg, 1841.
- SCHMIDT, P. W., *Die Sprachen der Sakri und Semang auf Malacca und ihr Verhältnis zu den Mon-Khmer Sprachen*. Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië. 6<sup>e</sup> Volgreeks, 8<sup>e</sup> Deel, pp. 399-583.
- *Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde*. Kulturgeschichtliche Bibliothek, I Reihe, Ethnologische Bibliothek, 5. Heidelberg, 1926.
- *Grundzüge einer Lautlehre d. Khasisprache in ihren Beziehungen zu derjenigen d. Mon-Khmer Sprachen*. Abhandlungen der königl. bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu München, I Kl., Bd. xxii, Abt. 3, München, 1904.
- *Grundzüge einer Lautlehre der Mon-Khmer Sprachen*. Denkschriften d. kaiserl. Akad. d. Wissensch. in Wien; Philosoph.-histor. Kl., Bd. li, Hft. 3, Wien, 1905.
- *Die Mon-Khmer Völker, ein Bindeglied zwischen Völkern Zentralasiens und Austronesiens*, Archiv. für Anthropologie, Neue Folge, Bd. v, Hft. 1 u. 2, Braunschweig, 1906. Translated as: *Les Peuples Mon-Khmer, trait d'Union entre les Peuples de l'Asie Centrale et de l'Austronesie*, BEFEO., t. vii (1907), fasc. 3 et 4.
- SCHRADEK, F. OTTO, *Problems of the Siamese Alphabet*, Journal of the Siam Society, vol. xxi (1928), pp. 211-18.
- *Siamese Mute H.*, Asia Major, vol. iii (1926), pp. 33-48.
- *Transcription and Explanaton of the Siamese Alphabet*, Asia Major vol. i (1924), pp. 45-66.

- SCHROETER, F. C. G., *A Dictionary of the Bhotanta or Boutan Language, to which is prefixed a Grammar of the Bhotanta Language*, Serampore, 1826.
- SCHUBERT, J., *Tibetische Nationalgrammatik*, 1 Teil: *Das Sum-cu-pa und Rtags-kyi-jug-pa des Lama Dbyaṅs-can-grub-pai-rdo-rje*, Mitt. d. Sem. für Orient. Sprachen, Jhrg. xxxi, Erste Abt., pp. 1-59, Berlin, 1928.
- SCOTT, Sir GEORGE, *Burma: A Handbook of Practical Commercial and Political Information*, 2nd ed., London, 1911.
- SEIDENSTÜCKER, KARL, *Beiträge zur Altbirmanischen Wortkunde*, Asia Major, iv (1927), pp. 1-28.
- SHAHA, B. N., *A Grammar of the Lushei Language*, Calcutta, 1884.
- SHAKESPEAR, J., *The Lushei Kuki Clans*, London, 1912.
- SHAKESPEAR, L. W., *History of Upper Assam, Upper Burmah and the North-Eastern Frontier*, London, 1914.
- SHAW, W., *Notes on the Thadou Kukis*, Journ. and Proc. ASB., vol. xxiv (1928), No. 1.
- SHAW, F. B., *On the Relationship between Tibetan Orthography and the Original Pronunciation of the Language*, Journ. Asiat. Soc. Berghal, vol. lxiii (1894), pp. 4-19.
- SIMON, W., *Zur Rekonstruktion der altchinesischen Endkonsonanten*, Sonderabdruck aus dem Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen, Bd. xxx (1927), Abt. 1, and Pd. xxxi (1928), Abt. 1.
- Si-tui sum rtags: *Tibetan Grammar, with a Commentary by Si-tu la-ma Yan-chan-do-rje*, Darjeeling, 1895. (See DAS, S. C., and Schubert, J., *sup.*)
- SKREFSRUD, L., *A Short Grammar of the Mech or Boro Language*, Benagoria, 1889.
- *Mecherne i Assam og deres Sprog*. Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi, Ny Raekke, ix, Kjobenhavn, 1889.
- SMITH, S. J., *The Principles of Siamese Grammar*, Bangkok, 1889.
- SMITH, W. C., *The Ao Naga Tribe of Assam: a Study in Ethnology and Sociology*, with an Introduction by J. H. Hutton, London, 1925.
- SOPPITT, C. A., *A Historical and Descriptive Account of the Kachari Tribes in the North Cachar Hills, with Specimens of Tales and Folk-lore*, Shillong, 1885.
- *A Short Account of the Kachcha Naga (Êmpéô) Tribe in the North Cachar Hills, with an Outline Grammar, Vocabulary, and Illustrative Sentences*, Shillong, 1885.
- *A Short Account of the Kuki-Lushai Tribes on the North-East Frontier, with an Outline Grammar of the Rangkhoh Lushai Language*, Shillong, 1887.
- STAËL-HOLSTEIN, Baron von, *The Kācāpaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class*. Edited in the original Sanskrit, in Tibetan and in Chinese, Shanghai, 1926.
- STEIN, Sir A., *Ancient Khotan*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1907.
- ST. JOHN, R. F. St. A., *A Burmese Reader*, Oxford, 1894.
- SYMINGTON, A., *A Kachin Vocabulary*, Rangoon, 1901.
- TAYLOR, L. F., *On the Tones of Certain Languages of Burma*, Bull. School of Orient. Studies, London Institution, vol. i (1920), pp. 91-106.
- THOMAS, F. W., *The Language of Ancient Khotan*, Asia Major, vol. ii (1925), pp. 251-71.
- *Tibetan Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan*. I. *The Ha-za*. JRAS., 1927, pp. 51-85. II. *The Sa-cu Region*, JRAS., 1927, pp. 807-44; 1928, pp. 63-98. III. *The Nob Region*, JRAS., 1928, pp. 555-95.
- and G. L. M. CLAUSON, *A Chinese Buddhist Text in Tibetan Writing*, JRAS., 1926, pp. 508-26.
- and G. L. M. CLAUSON, *A Second Chinese Buddhist Text in Tibetan Characters*, JRAS., 1927, pp. 281-306.
- *Note Supplementary to the Article "A Second Chinese-Buddhist Text in Tibetan Characters"*, JRAS., 1927, pp. 858-60.

- VIAL, PAUL, *De la Langue et de l'Écriture indigènes au Yun-nan*, Paris, 1890.
- *Dictionnaire français-Lolo, Dialecte Gni*, Hongkong, 1909.
- *Les Lolos : Histoire, Religion, Mœurs, Langue, Écriture*, Shanghai, 1898.
- VIDYĀBHŪSANA, SATIS CHANDRA, *A Bilingual Index of Nyāya-bindu*, Bibliotheca Indica (Asiatic Soc. Bengal), Calcutta, 1917.
- *Sanskrit Works on Literature, Grammar, Rhetoric, and Lexicography as preserved in Tibet*, Journ. Asiat. Soc. Bengal, vol. iii (1917), pp. 121-32.
- and DENISON ROSS, *Mahāyutpatti, a Sanskrit-Tibetan-English Vocabulary*, Memoirs Asiatic Soc. Bengal, iv, 1, Calcutta, 1910.
- VOSSON, L., *Grammaire franco-birmannaise, d'après la Grammaire de Judson*, Paris, 1889.
- WADE, J., *A Dictionary of the Sgaw Karen Language* Rangoon, 1896.
- WALKER, G. D., *A Dictionary of the Mikir Language, Mikir-English and English-Mikir*, Shillong, 1925.
- WALLESEER, M., *Ge las 'byugs med. Die tibetische Version von Nāgārjuna's Kommentar Akutobhaya zur Madhyamaka-kīrikā, nach der Pekingener Ausgabe des Tanjur*, Heidelberg, 1923. Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus, Hft. 2.
- *Prajñā-Pradīpāḥ : A Commentary on the Madhyamaka Sūtra by Bhāvarireka*, Bibliotheca Indica (Asiatic Soc. Bengal), Calcutta, 1914.
- *Zur Aussprache des Sanskrit und Tibetischen*, Heidelberg, 1926. Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus, Hft. 11.
- WALSH, E. H. C., *A Vocabulary of the Tromowa Dialect of Tibetan spoken in the Chumbi Valley*, Calcutta, 1905.
- WANGDAN (LAMA), *Tibetan Primer*, Nos. 1-2; *Revised, Transcribed in Roman Characters and Translated into English by Satis Chandra Acharyya, Vidyabhusan*, 3rd and 2nd ed., Calcutta, 1902. (For No. 3, see GYA-TSHO, sup.)
- WEHRLI, HANS J., *Beitrag zur Ethnologie der Chingpaw (Kachin) von Ober-Burma*, Archiv. fur Ethnographie, Bd. xvi, Supplement, Leiden, 1904.
- WIEGER, L., *Chinese Characters : Their Origin, Etymology, History, Classification, and Signification*, 2nd Eng. Ed. (Acc. 4th French Ed.), Hsien-hsien, 1927.
- WILLIAMSON, W. J., *A Vocabulary of the Garo and Kanchi Dialects*, Journ. Asiat. Soc. Beng., vol. xxxviii (1869), pt. i, pp. 14-20.
- WITTER, W. E., *Outline Grammar of the Lhōlá Nāgā Language, with a Vocabulary and Illustrative Sentences*, Calcutta, 1888.
- WOLFENDEN, STUART N., *Note on the Tribal Name Bārā f'-sá*, JRAS., 1929, pp. 851-3.
- *A Further Note on Bārā f'-sá*, JRAS., 1929, pp. 869-70.
- *On Ok Myit and She Pok, with a Proposed Revision of the Terminology of Burmese "Tones"*, JBRS., vol. xix, pt. 3 (Dec. 1929).
- *Significance of Early Tibetan Word Forms*, JRAS., 1928, pp. 896-9.
- *The Prefix m- with Certain Substantives in Tibetan*, Language, Journal of the Linguistic Society of America, vol. iv (1928), pp. 277-280.
- WOODTHORPE, R. G., *Notes on the Wild Tribes inhabiting the so-called Naga Hills on our North-East Frontier of India*, Journ. Roy. Anthropol. Inst., xi (1881), pp. 56-72.



## ABBREVIATIONS

acc.	according to.
Âh.	Âhom.
B.	Burmese.
BEFEO.	Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient, Hanoi.
Bâ.	Bâra.
CB.	Conrady, A., <i>Eine indo-chinesische Causativ-Denominativ Bildung</i> . (See Bibliography, p. 205.)
CCh.	Central Chin.
col.	colloquial.
Cs.	Csoma de Koros, <i>Tibetan-English Dictionary</i> . (See Bibliography, p. 205.)
CT.	Central Tibet.
Dic. (or D.)	<i>Dictionary</i> .
Dim.	Dimâ-sâ.
ET.	Eastern Tibet.
<i>Frühlingsm.</i>	Francke, A. H., <i>Der Frühlingsmythus der Kessarsage</i> . (See Bibliography, p. 206.)
Gr.	<i>Grammar</i> .
id.	<i>idem</i> , the same.
JA.	Journal Asiatique, Paris.
JAOS.	Journal of the American Oriental Society, New Haven, Conn.
JASB.	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
JBRs.	Journal of the Burma Research Society, Rangoon.
Jk.	Jäschke, H. A.
JRAS.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.
K.	Kachin.
KC.	Kuki-Chin.
Kg.	Karlgren, B., <i>Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese</i> . (See Bibliography, p. 203.)
Kh.	Khams.
KN.	Kachchâ Nâgâ (Êmpêo).
Ld.	Ladakh.
Lexx.	Native Lexicons (forms generally from Jäschke's <i>Dictionary</i> ).
Lh.	Lahoul.
lit.	literally.
LSI.	Linguistic Survey of India, Calcutta. (See Bibliography, p. 207.)
M.	Mikir.
NB.	Nâgâ-Bodo.
NCh.	Northern Chin.
NK.	Nâgâ-Kuki.
PAOS.	Proceedings of the American Oriental Society, New Haven, Conn.
pr.	prouounced.
resp.	respectful, -ly.
S.	Siamese.
SC.	Southern Chin.
Sch.	Schmidt, I. J., <i>Tibetisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch</i> . (See Bibliography, p. 212.)
Schr.	Schroeter, F. C. G., <i>A Dictionary of the Bhotanta or Boutan Language</i> . (See Bibliography, p. 213.)

Sh.	Shân.
Si-Hia	Laufer, B., <i>The Si-Hia Language: A Study in Indo-Chinese Philology</i> . (See Bibliography, p. 209.)
Sp.	Spiti.
Sprachw.	Laufer, B., <i>Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft der Tibeter</i> . (See Bibliography, p. 209.)
ST.	<i>Si-tui sum-rtags</i> (ed. Sarat Chandra Das). (See Bibliography p. 205.)
T.	Tibetan.
T'P.	T'oung Pao, Leiden.
Ts.	Tsan.
TS.	Schiefner, A., <i>Tibetische Studien</i> . (See Bibliography, p. 212.)
Winterm.	Francke, A. H., <i>Der Wintermythus der Kesarage</i> . (See Bibliography, p. 206.)
w.l.	written language.
WT.	Western Tibet.
WZKM.	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Wien.
Zam.	<i>Zamatog</i> ; Żalupa's work on Tibetan orthography and grammar. (See Bibliography, p. 209.)
ZDMG.	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig.
Δ marks <i>de nid</i> terms. See § 11 <i>sup</i> .	









